West Virginia History

A Quarterly Magazine

April, 1945

Cecile R. Goodall, *Editor* Bess Harrison, *Managing Editor*

VOLUME VI APRIL, 1945 NUMBER 3

Contents

The Newspaper Press and the Civil War in West Virginia, by Roy Watson Curry ---------- 225

The Preservation and Restoration of Historic West Virginia (Illustrated), by Charles J. Milton ---------- 265

DOCUMENTS:

West Virginians in the American Revolution, assembled and edited by Ross B. Johnston ---------- 272

BOOK REVIEWS:

Freeman, *Lee's Lieutenants: A Study in Command*, II, III, by William E. Brooks ---------- 277

Henry, *First with the Most-Forrest*, by William E. Brooks ---------- 277

Hebert, *Fighting Joe Hooker*, by William E. Brooks ---------- 277

Wiltse, *John C. Calhoun, Nationalist*, by William E. Brooks ---------- 277

Milton, *The Use of Presidential Power*, by William E. Brooks ---------- 277

Wiley, *The Plain People of the Confederacy*, by George F. Scheer 282

Dean, *Fighting Dan of the Long Rifles*, by George F. Scheer ---------- 284

State History as Featured by the Press ---------- 287

Recent Accessions to the State Department of Archives and History 289

Contributor's Page ---------- 292

West Virginia History, a quarterly magazine published in January, April, July, and October, by the State Department of Archives and History, Charleston, West Virginia.

Subscription price ---------- $2.00 per year

Single number ---------- 50 cents

Correspondence concerning contributions, books for review, and subscriptions may be sent to the editors, care of the Department of Archives and History.

The Department of Archives and History assumes no responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Offices: State Capitol, Charleston, West Virginia.

The Newspaper Press and the Civil War in West Virginia

By Roy Watson Curry

The War and the Press

Colorful and proficient editors characterize the journalism of the Civil War period. Such men as Horace Greeley, James Gordon Bennett, and William Cullen Bryant, of the New York press, were national figures; and their papers were magnified expressions of their personalities. Speaking forth in robust and picturesque language, these men were of great force in American life. Provincial papers were likewise organs of outspoken men as romantic in character as any who have appeared on the American scene. This was the heroic age of American newspaper enterprise; "no war before or since has made such demands upon the press."[1] The era of personal journalism was to fade in the wake of the war; people became more interested in the news than in the character of the editor.[2]

Bennett's *Herald*

Of all the influential journals of the period possibly none was more widely read and followed than James Gordon Bennett's New York *Herald*. He had labored passionately on his paper for over twenty-six years before the outbreak of the war and had done, during that time, a great deal to personalize and popularize journalism. His innovations had been so original that he was considered both the black sheep of the press and the represen-

---

[1] James M. Lee, *History of American Journalism* (New York, 1923), p. 318.
[2] A journalist, "The New York Herald, from 1835 to 1866. The Fourth Estate: Contribution toward a History of Newspapers and the Liberty of the Press," *North American Review*, Vol. CII (April, 1866), pp. 373-419.

tative American journalist.[3] A Scotch lad who, by diligence, had risen to the most influential and remunerative post in America's "Fourth Estate," Bennett was pro-slavery, pro-Tammany, and pro-Bennett. Not until a mob gathered before his office did he become pro-Union. "His paper was, in fact, a Democratic organ when it possibly could be without being absolutely disloyal."[4] Yet, it was generally believed that Lincoln read only the *Herald*.[5]

Newspapers in America were unprepared to handle the volume of news created by the war. Each paper had its war correspondents, but they were not trained for such work. Washington was the key news center in the East, while St. Louis, Cairo, and Louisville led in the West. Telegraph service was meagre and interrupted. Despite their handicaps, the correspondents often outstripped army intelligence.[6]

Before the war began, the *Herald* sent men to all parts of the South, including Western Virginia, to gather Southern papers and information about the Confederate situation. Because of such representation, it was able to publish information of such accuracy that some thought it in league with the Confederacy. Fully one-half million dollars were spent on sixty-three[7] correspondents by the *Herald* during the years of strife. The arduous task of gathering the news was brought to the attention of the public in articles similar to the following:

> Readers little imagine at what price the army news that they read and carelessly cast aside is sometimes purchased, or at what risk to life and as well as liberty the correspondent often gets the material for a letter. Since the war began ten of our correspondents have fallen into the enemy's hands, and been held as prisoners; we have lost two by death, and one has been badly wounded in battle.

---

[3] Allen Johnson (ed.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, "James Gordon Bennett," Vol. II, p. 195 ff.
[4] George Henry Payne, *History of Journalism in the United States* (New York, 1920), p. 318.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 267.
[6] F. Lauriston Bullard, *Famous War Correspondents* (Boston, 1914), p. 377.
[7] C. H. Livermore, "The Rise of Metropolitan Journalism, 1800-1840," *American Historical Review*, Vol. VI (April, 1901), pp. 446-465.

> Such a record will give some idea of the danger of a correspondent's life, and of the enterprising Herald correspondents in particular.[8]

Normally the *Herald* consisted of eight, six column sheets, carrying foreign, commercial, and domestic news. The editorial page was a good cross section of American life. Beginning with the outbreak of the war and continuing until the peace, a column appeared discussing "The Situation." It contained a summary of current war events. Other editorials "lambasted" or praised contemporary editors, boasted of the *Herald's* circulation (120,000 daily by March 19, 1865),[9] discussed the censorship, political affairs, and contemporary matters. Headlines were conservative; leading news was found on the front page; maps were often published.

Like all papers, it erred at times in giving the truth of the situation; but its standards were markedly high: ". . . in the news department immense industry, vigilance, and tact; in the editorial columns, the vein of Mephistophelean mockery which . . . puzzled and shocked so many good people at home and abroad."[10]

The *Herald* was conscious of its historical documentation, by its correspondents, of the war. "Nothing more graphic, picturesque and accurate, has, we will venture to say, ever yet been written than these descriptions of the events of the campaign."[11] It did publish letters from the troops, but to a much less extent than the small dailies.

The boost of the war circulation made a bigger and better *Herald*. New presses and an enlarged building enabled rapid and extensive publication. In May, 1865, it boasted:

> Identified most intimately and inseparably with this city and this country, the New York Herald must begin to prepare for the magnificent future before it. The position which we shall hold as the leading journal of the leading city, of the leading nation of the earth will have its responsibilities as well as its dignities and advantages . . .

---

[8] New York *Herald*, January 30, 1864.
[9] *Ibid.*, March 19, 1865.
[10] A journalist, *op. cit.*, p. 390 f.
[11] New York *Herald*, July 16, 1862.

> Just as there is a Herald Headquarters' tent with every army and a Herald bureau at Washington, so there shall be a Herald legation in all the chief cities from Melbourne to Spitzbergen.[12]

THE CINCINNATI *Daily Commercial*

Although lacking the vibrant personality of a Bennett, the proprietor and editor of the Cincinnati *Commercial*, M. D. Potter, was no less a successful figure. Coming to the paper in 1848, as a job-printer, he soon rose to such responsibility that he became a partner with L. G. Curtis, the editor. Upon the latter's death, in 1851, he became the proprietor. The paper was run then and throughout the war under the ownership of M. D. Potter Company. It was always pro-Union, pro-Republican, and pro-Ohio.[13]

Murat Halstead and Henry Reed, associating themselves with the company before the war, became the real color of the *Commercial*. Potter had the general direction of the office and management of the business; Halstead was in charge of the news, and Reed was the chief editorial writer.[14] Of these men, Halstead became the representative of the paper. From 1854 to 1866 he was editor-in-chief, and through his efforts the paper became one of the most influential in the West. Halstead had character above all else. A contemporary evaluation said: "He does not always take the right side of a question, nor does he advocate this side in the wisest manner, but his integrity and public spirit are always potent."[15] He became "Ohio's best-known newspaper man in the post-bellum years."[16]

Finances of the *Commercial* were limited; and flocks of correspondents, such as those maintained by the *Her-*

---

[12] New York *Herald*, May 7, 1865.
[13] Henry A. Ford and Mrs. Kate B. Ford (compilers), *History of Cincinnati, Ohio, with Illustrations and Biographical Sketches* (Cleveland, 1881), p. 292.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 292.
[15] Galaxy Publishing Company, *The Biographical Encyclopedia of Ohio of the Nineteenth Century* (Cincinnati, 1876), p. 434.
[16] Eugene Halloway Roseboom and Francis Phelps Wersenburger, *A History of Ohio* (New York, 1934), p. 434.

ald, were impossible. Several men were employed to cover the action in the field. Among these was J. B. McCullough whose Mac, or Max, signed at the bottom of dispatches bearing date lines from every front tell of his adventurous experiences. He was in Western Virginia, on board the flag ship of Commodore Foote during the attack on Ft. Donelson, participant in a Mississippi cavalry raid, and engaged in the full experiences of a veteran at the front.[17] Such men were invaluable news sources, but the hundreds of young men from Ohio writing home to the *Commercial* made it a more enlightening source of news.

Throughout the war, with few exceptions, the *Commercial* continued to be a four page, size 21"x27", nine column sheet. It carried telegraphic and Associated Press services. There was no editorial page, as such, but an attempt at editorializing was found on page two. Foreign and domestic news were featured. Often the foreign news was cut from the *Times* or a similar English journal. Approximately ten of the thirty-six columns were devoted to advertisements. Advertising became so prolific that, from time to time, extra columns were published.[18]

Numerous complaints[19] were caused by the small type used, but no improvement was made until the installation of a new press in 1864.[20] At this time the daily circulation of the paper had risen to between 30,000 and 35,000. The *Commercial* claimed that only the New York *Herald* had a greater outside circulation.[21] It was of greater importance than its size would indicate; it was one of Ohio's leading papers; and the largest, in circulation, published in war-thriving Cincinnati.[22]

---

[17] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial,* May 11, 1863.
[18] *Ibid,* March 27, 1863.
[19] *Ibid,* November 2, 1864; November 29, 1864.
[20] *Ibid.,* October 22, 1864.
[21] *Ibid.,* October 26, 1864.
[22] *Ibid.,* October 26, 1864.

CAMPBELL'S *Intelligencer*

Archibald W. Campbell was the soul and breath of the Wheeling *Daily Intelligencer* and, as such, of the Union cause in Western Virginia. "The history of the *Intelligencer* during the war is the history of the Union and new state cause. They will all remain one and inseparable in the annals of West Virginia."[23]

This nephew of the great Alexander Campbell of Bethany "was thoroughly saturated with the spirit of antislavery and free soil doctrine, and right bravely did he defend them . . . He soon made a name for the journal, situated as it was right on the border of the slave states . . .".[24] As the "Greeley of the Border" he engaged in many duels of words with his competitors in Wheeling. His grand-eloquent manner of expression, coupled with his forthright, outspoken opinion on all matters, gave to him a false flamboyant appearance. It may be truly said:

> The career of Mr. Campbell during the war between the states was of the most aggressive character, but it was consistent and manly. He was a vigorous but generous foe. There were some very dark days during that time, but his spirit never flagged, and it was this attitude on the part of the Intelligencer that buoyed the hopes of the downcast.[25]

Correspondents of the *Intelligencer,* like the *Commercial,* were few. Campbell, for John F. McDermott was editor in name only, depended for much of his news upon other papers, the Wheeling government, and army sources, in addition to the soldiers in the field. The *Intelligencer* invited the enlisted men to write for it. "We wish that all our enlisted soldiers in Western Virginia will consider themselves at home in our paper."[26] This was in keeping with the editor's policy of carrying local news in his columns. "One item in Western Virginia

---

[23] Wheeling *Intelligencer,* February 14, 1899.
[24] *Ibid.,* "50th Anniversary Souvenir Edition," August 24, 1902.
[25] *Ibid.*
[26] Wheeling *Intelligencer,* September 28, 1861.

news we value more than a dozen foreign ones."[27] Such a policy was partly due to the subscription being confined mostly to "what we expect to [*sic*] (for the present) to be the new State of Kanawha . . .".[28] It had a national reputation and was quoted in all the presses of the country.[29]

A four page, size 16½"x21¾", seven column sheet, it carried miscellaneous news, Associated Press and telegraphic service features. Often seventeen of the paper's twenty-eight columns were advertising. No regular editorial page, as we know it today, was maintained; but the second page bore a resemblance to such. The editors were likely to editorialize at the end of news stories. All the facts were presented in brief form. Patriotism was expounded by an American flag, or eagle, or by quotations from speeches of America's heroic dead appearing on the second page. For slavery and secession there were no tolerance. It was pro-Union, pro-Republican and pro-new state in tone. By July 19, 1864, this paper demanded a cash outlay for expenses of publication totaling one hundred dollars a day.[30]

THE WAR AND THE PEOPLE

Civil war is aptly styled the bloodiest of all wars; but when such a conflict rages between two sections of the same state, allied by historical and family ties, the enmity and ferociousness can be only the more bitter. None could see that the conflict of 1861 would result in the severance of the Old Dominion, and four years of the bitterest warfare, in which the counties west of the mountains were to furnish 30,000 men to the Union and 7,000 to the Confederacy.[31]

The importance of West Virginia in its adherence to

---

[27] *Ibid.*
[28] *Ibid.*, September 30, 1861.
[29] *Ibid.*, "50th Anniversary Souvenir Edition," August 24, 1902.
[30] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, July 19, 1864.
[31] Edward Conrad Smith, *The Borderland in the Civil War* (New York, 1927), p. 384; Charles H. Ambler, *A History of West Virginia* (New York, 1933), p. 336.

the Union cannot be passed over lightly. Her decision decreased the manpower of the Confederacy, reduced the jurisdiction of the Richmond government, deprived the South of the invaluable line of the Ohio River,[32] opened the Baltimore and Ohio to Union transportation moving east and west, and denied the seceded states such essential materials as coal, iron, and salt. A Pennsylvania citizen observed, "If that section [of Virginia] had been filled by rabid Rebels, and given up entirely to their sway, our border counties would have been making a sad history during the last two years."[33]

Virginia and the Confederacy were awake to the strategic and material advantages of retaining the western counties. In a letter dated April 27, 1861, to General Robert E. Lee, directing Colonel Thomas J. Jackson be assigned to duty at Harper's Ferry, Governor John Letcher of Virginia commanded: "Direct him [Jackson] to make diligent inquiry as to the state of feeling in the northwestern portion of the State."[34] If necessary, Letcher authorized the appointment of a special agent for this purpose;[35] but General Lee failed to mention the Northwest in his orders to Jackson.[36] Writing to the Hon. L. P. Walker of the Confederate War Department, Letcher states that precautionary measures have been taken and arrangements completed for calling out 50,000 Virginia volunteers, should conditions make it necessary. Such forces were to rendezvous at Norfolk, Richmond, Fredericksburg, Alexandria, Harper's Ferry, Grafton, Kanawha, Parkersburg, and Moundsville.[37] By May 4, 1861, Lee had ordered the gathering of forces at Harper's Ferry, Grafton, Wheeling and Kanawha. While there was some doubt as to feeling concerning secession in Western Virginia, Southern leaders thought state pride, political attachments, and a show of force

[32] *Ibid.*, p. 218.
[33] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, August 14, 1863.
[34] *The War of the Rebellion: A Compilation of the Official Records of the Union and Confederate Armies* (Washington, 1881-1901), Vol. II, p. 784.
[35] *Ibid.*, p. 784 f.
[36] *Ibid.*, p. 785.
[37] *Ibid.*, p. 792.

would overcome any momentary hesitation.[38] But to some Virginia had more to fear from rebellion in her western counties than from northern invasion. The trouble in the West was no "tempest in a teapot."[39]

West Virginia was, however, Union in sentiment.[40] November 12, 1860, the people of Preston County declared for the Union. The citizens of Monongalia did not see the election of Lincoln as justification for secession.[41] In Wheeling the townsmen deplored the Republican victory, but thought it not sufficient reason for the action of South Carolina.[42] The attitude of the press, the pulpit, and mass meetings left "no doubt concerning its militant [*sic*] Union sentiment of the people."[43] From Berkeley County, on the Potomac, to Wood County, on the Little Kanawha, public addresses and resolutions showed the determination to resist the state authorities.[44] In some counties, such as Pocahontas, Greenbrier, Monroe, Mercer, and McDowell, Union sentiment was negligible; in the Eastern Panhandle the Confederacy held sway.[45] The cause of the South was favored six to one in the eastern counties, and considerable success was had in enlisting men for the Confederate armies.[46] In Hampshire County alone half the men were in the Confederate army, a total of 1,200 soldiers, or thirteen companies or parts of companies,[47] while only one company of Union men was organized in the county.[48] Money was appropriated for the defense of the citizens from the Union invaders.

The spotty character, Union and Southern, of the country is aptly described by a visitor in Wheeling from Jackson and adjoining counties: ". . . it is no uncommon

---

[38] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 106.
[39] New York *Herald*, August 10, 1861.
[40] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, August 3, 1862.
[41] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, August 2, 1861.
[42] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, January 7, 1861.
[43] Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 81.
[44] *Ibid.*, p. 190.
[45] *Ibid.*, p. 362.
[46] Hu Maxwell and H. L. Swisher, *History of Hampshire County, West Virginia, From its Earliest Settlement to the Present* (Morgantown, 1897), p. 158.
[47] *Ibid.*, p. 545.
[48] *Ibid.*, p. 639.

thing for a traveler to find himself in a strong secession neighborhood one hour, and the next in a Union precinct [*sic*]."[49] Secessionists were strong enough in some counties to make it unwise for local Unionists to remain at home. A certain Dr. Parsons of St. George was an exemplary case. The aged man was chased from his home and forced to spend some weeks at Cranberry Summit [Terra Alta] before attempting to return.[50] Confederate sympathizers around Philippi, regardless of Union forces, were "quite strong [as] indicated by the daring of their guerrilla parties, and the increased timidity of the inhabitants who blow [blew] Union hot or Union cold according to the demonstrations on either side of the contending parties."[51] Local companies, or guerrillas, took to the field and continued to roam and molest the countryside throughout the war.[52] Adopting picturesque names, as the "Swampers," an Union organization in Pendleton County, they did much to make the war an individual affair of brother against brother.

Interesting stories of these raiders appeared in the press. A letter from Glenville, dated April 4, 1863, tells of one, William Wilson, a Confederate guerrilla thief, and another bushwhacker, who came to the home of the Widow Varner, near there, and took her son, Lee, six dollars, two guns, two horses, and a man by the name of Adam Glick. While making their escape they stopped to pillage at Job Varner's. One man remained outside to take care of Glick and the horses, while Wilson took Lee with him to the house. Lee's sister had come to the rescue of her brother and, unnoticed by Wilson, managed to hand him a gun. Lee, waiting his opportunity, fired and killed Wilson; the other raider took to the woods.[53]

Often guerrilla outbreaks encouraged official interference as when a certain Sheriff Trayham [or Trahern]

---

[49] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, June 21, 1861.
[50] *Ibid.*, October 15, 1861.
[51] New York *Herald*, July 3, 1861.
[52] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, February 4, 1864; Wheeling *Intelligencer*, October 6, 1864; Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, March 26, 1863.
[53] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, April 17, 1863.

of Barbour County was arrested by marauding Confederate forces, and Union troops took into custody fifteen men and women of Southern sympathy, who were to be shot if Trayham was not returned. General John D. Imboden, then Confederate commander in Western Virginia, declared for each Confederate killed he would execute two Union prisoners. General Robert H. Milroy, the Union commander, replied that he had more Southern prisoners than Imboden had Northern men; and he warned the Confederate general to beware of trifling with Federal humanity.[54]

Armies of both the North and the South foraged to secure food for their soldiers. Frequently such campaigns were well conducted, but more often they led to bad feeling between the soldiers and citizens.[55] The attitude of the soldier in these brutal campaigns was well expressed by one of Sheridan's men during the Shenandoah raids in 1864:

> "You see the most of 'ems secesh families; the women are Union to a man," winked he, "and the husbands are brothers, and sons in with the rebs; but for all that it's hard when the women come out on their knees, crying and praying, and the children clinging to 'em."
>
> "But," said he, "it's a good deal harder to go along a road, and right along by the side of the woods, to find your own brother hanging to a tree, with his ears, his nose, and his lips cut off as I did mine last week!"[56]

Patriotism rioted in the hearts of the citizenry both Northern and Southern. Union dinners were quite common; the presentation of flags to companies became a major passion with the women, and business houses made similar gifts to advertise their firms. "Flags for Sale" became an ordinary advertisement in the Wheeling *Intelligencer*.[57] Wheeling and other localities organized local home guards very much in the spirit of doing their

---

[54] *Ibid.*, February 7, 1863.
[55] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, July 14, 1864.
[56] *Ibid.*, November 4, 1864.
[57] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, August 10, 1861; August 12, 1861.

all for "The Cause."[58] Huge welcomes were staged upon the return of volunteers from the front.[59] Enlistment in the Union forces was encouraged by the press.[60] Wheeling was aflame with Union patriotism; citizens often showed their sentiments in such a realistic fashion as the following:

> Night before last a half drunken fellow passed down Market street screaming at the top of his voice, "Hurrah for Jeff Davis." As he passed the McLure House a soldier, supposed to belong to the 1st Virginia Regiment, walked out in the street and deliberately knocked the man down with his closed fist. The Jeff Davis man got up and walked away bleeding and muttering that "things has come to a d— pretty pass when a man can't express his sentiments without being knocked down."[61]

Reports as to the patriotism of a section were often contradictory. Girls in Charleston both spurned and married the Union soldiers.[62] The citizenry cheered the Union troops but refused to fight a fire threatening the destruction of the Union occupied town.[63]

All the manifest Union sentiment was not of the variety that gives birth to national epics. A letter from Grafton deplored the loss to the government of fifty dollars an animal in a military horse sale to the public. This loss occurred even though the horses had seen only two months military service. Campbell commented, ". . . we are astonished that they lasted half of sixty days. Nearly all the old crow-baits in this section 'enlisted'."[64] Patriots often gained at the expense of their government.

Intimidation and abuse were heaped upon the man who failed to stand firmly and publicly for the North. Judge George W. Summers was labeled in the *Intelligencer* as "cold, selfish, timid; he loved his money, his houses, and his lands more than he did the cause of the Union. . . . Mournful sight indeed! to see a man whose

---

[58] *Ibid.*, February 11, 1864.
[59] *Ibid.*, August 21, 1861.
[60] *Ibid.*, August 30, 1861.
[61] *Ibid.*, January 15, 1864; January 20, 1864.
[62] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, March 5, 1863.
[63] *Ibid.*, May 26, 1864; Wheeling *Intelligencer*, August 2, 1861.
[64] *Ibid.*, September 4, 1861.

name was a tower of strength, whose voice was a rallying note for his people, failing them, failing himself and failing his country when all eyes were turned to him for leadership."[65]

At no time did the Union press despair of the outcome of the conflict. At every opportunity it emphasized the helplessness of the Southern forces. From the New York *Herald* the following assertions are extracted:

> The secession soldiers get drunk when they please, and are disorderly in Martinsburg.
>
> The Berkeley County Guards, ninety-five men, and Wise Artillery, eighty-four men, who six weeks ago went from Martinsburg, the former now numbers twenty-four men; the latter twenty, caused from desertions and disease.
>
> The Bunker company have all deserted. The Knockingham company all laid down their arms and departed disgusted. Almost all the latter voted against the secession ordinance.[66]

Reports such as "300 Cherokee Indians from North Carolina, in full war costume, with tomahawks and scalping knives" accompanied the Confederates to Point of Rocks[67] were ridiculous. Certain Northern papers claimed Union soldiers were fighting the battles for a people in Western Virginia who would not place enough soldiers in the field to protect themselves. The editor of the Wellsburg *Herald* joined in this cry.[68] To the latter Campbell tersely replied:

> It is about time such reports "dried up." Western Virginia has more troops in the service of the United States, in proportion to her population, than has the State of New York or Ohio. She has seven full regiments in the field, and she has four more in process of completion . . . A people who have secessionists *among* them, as well as in *front* of them, are in no condition to join the army en masse as the simple strictures of some of these editors would seem to indicate. . . . Every county almost in Western Virginia, is constantly threatened by enemies within its own limits. For instance, we have in this county,

---

[65] *Ibid.*, November 29, 1861.
[66] *Ibid.*, July 1, 1861.
[67] New York *Herald*, May 25, 1861.
[68] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, August 5, 1861.

> just here on the immediate border, as bitter and as malignant a set of traitors as live in the State. And they are not a few in number, either, although many of them wear the disguise of Union pretense.[69]

With the imposition of the draft, June, 1863, West Virginia's quota was 10,000 soldiers to which Campbell protested: "Less than half of West Virginia can be reached by our authorities. Whenever we go south of the line of the N. W. Virginia Railroad we shall find but few counties, if any, in which a draft can be executed to do any good."[70] The draft must fall on a dozen counties of the Northwest which have already sent 20,000 troops to the field, "a larger per cent than any State in the Union according to the actual population from which it was drawn."[71] Only 25,000 men voted for state officers, after deducting a large percentage for those over forty-five and the infirm. "The fact is ten thousand men will just about sweep all the able-bodied population from the State."[72] The New York *Herald* likewise supported the position that the border states had furnished their full quotas, "besides being subjected to war ravages and rapine."[73] It considered the Wheeling Convention equal to an "army of fifty-thousand men."[74]

THE GENERALS, MADE AND UNMADE

THE FEDERALS

Military events, local prejudice, and advertisement in the press made and unmade the military men of both sides. Each had his enemies and friends, his advocates and critics.

At the end of the year 1861, the Confederates had been beaten back on most all fronts in Western Virginia. With the exceptions of Generals William W. Loring

[69] *Ibid.*, October 10, 1861.
[70] *Ibid.*, June 16, 1863.
[71] *Ibid.*
[72]. *Ibid.*
[73] New York *Herald*, October 16, 1862.
[74] *Ibid.*, June 11, 1861.

and Thomas J. "Stonewall" Jackson, only General Edward Johnson at Camp Alleghany remained in the region.

GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN

Such marvelous results, in clearing the whole of northwestern Virginia, were attributed to the zeal and genius of one man, General George Brinton McClellan.[75] After his victories at Rich Mountain, Laurel Hill (July 11, 1861), and Beverly. the New York *Herald* commented:

> The name of General McClellan is upon every lip. His praises are sung [*sic*] by the government ministers, the military officials, from the highest to the lowest and the universal populace. A second victory [Beverly] for McClellan in less than twenty-four hours! "Hurrah for McClellan!" is shouted on the street, and "Here's to McClellan!" is the toast in private parlors, at tables, and in bar rooms." . . . All tongues unite in pronouncing him the Garibaldi of the war. . . .[76]

After the defeat of General Robert Garnett and his Confederate forces at Corricks Ford the *Herald* declared McClellan's first campaign had come to an end and gave him "all praise" for his skill and untiring energy.[77] James Kendall Hosmer in his *The Appeal to Arms* declared that the Western Virginia campaign produced two results: a new state and McClellan.[78]

In West Virginia and Ohio McClellan was considered the greatest of Civil War generals. Open and easy of access to the press, writing for the dailies,[79] basking in the glory of his successful operations, he was idolized as the one general capable of leading the Union to victory. Was it not then proper that he should be called to succeed General Irvin McDowell as head of the Army of the Potomac, and later to lead the Union forces?

---

[75] New York *Herald*, August 11, 1862; George B. McClellan, *Report on the Organization and Camps of the Army of the Potomac to which is Added an Account of the Campaign in Western Virginia with Plans of Battle-Fields*, pp. 7-35.
[76] New York *Herald*, July 15, 1861.
[77] *Ibid.*, July 16, 1861.
[78] In *The American Nation*, Vol. XX, p. 50 f.
[79] New York *Herald*, July 8, 1861.

Upon his being called to the Army of the Potomac the *Herald* said:

> The prestige of success that he bears about him, his high character for energy and skill and rapidity, and efficiency in organization and combination induce the belief that the error of Sunday last will soon be repaired. . . . If General Scott were to take the field in person he could hardly command more than this hero of the brilliant campaign in Western Virginia.[80]

McClellan always enjoyed great popularity among the soldiers. From a camp opposite Shepherdstown a soldier wrote: "Yesterday a clergyman was driven out of the camps in this vicinity by the troops for assailing the generalship of General McClellan. The army will not tolerate aspersions upon "Little Mac."[81]

When McClellan was removed from command the Cincinnati *Commercial* took up his quarrel. It hinted that McClellan was a Democrat formerly much admired, and now (November, 1862) political and personal favoritism was playing its part in the selection of generals for the army.[82] From the soldiers the paper was lauded for its attitude: "We all admire the cause of the *Commercial* toward Major General McClellan, who is the favorite of the soldiery. There is no use to disguise the fact—not a bit. Your course is approved by nineteen-twentieths of the soldiers."[83] The *Intelligencer* voiced a different sentiment. It did not believe McClellan a Napoleon; it condemned his over-cautiousness, saying, "The average opinion of the country is, and it is ours, that if General McClellan had combined with his acknowledged caution, more tendency to move, more Stonewall Jacksonism, he would be exactly such a man as we need . . .". There was intimation that McClellan's political blunders were encouraged by his friends, and the paper deplored that such was the case.[84]

---

[80] *Ibid.*, July 28, 1861.
[81] New York *Herald*, October 31, 1862.
[82] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, November 10, 1862.
[83] *Ibid.*, February 4, 1863.
[84] *Ibid.*, January 5, 1863.

BENJAMIN F. KELLEY

Favorite son of West Virginia from the Battle of Philippi, Colonel, later General, Benjamin F. Kelley was regarded as a hero. At the "Philippi Races," June 3, 1861, he was wounded seriously. At first he was reported killed,[85] but he lived to return to Wheeling where he was made much over during his recuperation. Some forty-five of his friends presented him with a horse, "Phillippi," which was later kidnapped with him at Cumberland. The gift was made as a token of their appreciation of Kelley's character as a man and of his distinguished military service in Western Virginia.

Local stories were told about this "Napoleon of the Northwest" who, while at a distance of forty miles, "so frightened nine hundred rebels . . . that they fled in the greatest consternation, and only escaped the rolling of the ball by getting beyond the Allegheny mountains."[86]

After Kelley's transfer to what was known as the Railroad District, an account appeared in the New York *Tribune* concerning his having delivered two Negro slaves to their owners, after the Negroes had hidden and returned three Union soldiers from behind the Confederate advance. The *Intelligencer* was emphatic in declaring that Kelley never "performed superserviceable favors to the enemies of the government . . . He will perform his duty, but nothing more."[87]

Kelley's service at New Creek and Romney made him all the more popular. His ill health, early in 1862, forced him to ask for leave of absence. Immediately, some papers jumped to the conclusion that he was being superseded. The *Intelligencer* again came to his rescue, explaining the situation and stating: "General Kelley withdraws from his command loved and honored by all who know him."[88] General Frederick W. Lander succeeded him in command.

---

[85] New York *Herald*, June 4, 1861.
[86] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, September 7, 1861.
[87] *Ibid.*, March 29, 1862.
[88] *Ibid.*, January 1, 1862.

Kelley, on June 23, 1863, was assigned to command the Department of West Virginia, a position he held with unvarying success until General Franz Sigel was appointed (February 29, 1864) to succeed him. By this time the departmental news was reported in the *Herald* by Theodore C. Wilson, one of its correspondents, under the heading of "Kelley's Department." While holding this command Kelley captured the approval of all. His removal was vigorously protested. The Baltimore and Ohio did not favor the change. General-in-Chief Henry W. Halleck was rumored as opposing it.[89] The correspondent observed:

> At least it is evidence enough that General Kelley has discharged his duty in a semi-civil capacity faithfully and fearfully and when we find he is strongly and constantly opposed by the speculators, copperheads and secessionists, and that his field operations have met with the approval of the General-in-Chief.[90]

Sigel's appointment was looked upon as a political move to capture the German vote in the 1864 presidential election. The appointment was described as made "by the President on his own responsibility without consulting his military advisers."[91] The *Intelligencer* said all departments were apt to blame any misfortune on the commander,[92] adding: "We have had William S. Rosecrans and we have had John C. Fremont, and if the affairs were any better controlled under them, or if they gave any better satisfaction in any respect, then an ungrateful public has failed to make known the fact." Such matters as appointments, Campbell thought, should remain in the War Department; General Halleck knew of Kelley's ability to hold the position.[93]

May 6, 1864, Kelley was assigned to the command of the reserve division in the Department of West Virginia, and on December 31, 1864, he was given com-

[89] *Ibid.*, February 28, 1864.
[90] *Ibid.*
[91] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, February 25, 1864.
[92] *Ibid.*, February 9, 1864.
[93] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, February 9, 1864.

mand of the Second Infantry troops in West Virginia, operating from Hancock west to Wheeling. His brevet majorship came to him at this time.[94] On February 21, 1865, the Confederates, despite a full garrison of Union troops, under Lieutenant Jesse C. McNeil entered Cumberland and captured Generals Crook and Kelley.[95] Not until March 14, 1865, were the two returned to Cumberland from Richmond on parole.[96]

WILLIAM S. ROSECRANS

When McClellan was called to Washington to head the Army of the Potomac, he left General William Starke Rosecrans as commander of the forces in northwestern Virginia. Of Revolutionary antecedents, an honor graduate of West Point,[97] he was considered adequate to the command. Of his appointment the *Herald* observed: "It is said he is surrounded by a staff of excellent officers, an element which, in addition to his own coolness, sagacity and military skill, renders his position . . . secure from surprise or defeat."[98]

His fame was made at Rich Mountain when he flanked Colonel John Pegram's forces. Standing high in McClellan's estimation, he was nominated a brigadier general and appointed to succeed his superior, July 25, 1861. His defeat of the enemy at Summersville and Carnifex Ferry led to his appointment as head of the newly created (November 9, 1861) Department of West Virginia.[99]

When the Kanawha campaign failed to annihilate the enemy, Rosecrans was subjected to much criticism. The *Intelligencer* remarked:

> We would not cast any hasty censure upon the arrangements of the commander of our forces in that quarter, but we cannot help feeling surprised that no more decisive

[94] *Ibid.*, August 13, 1864.
[95] New York *Herald*, February 22, 1865; Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, February 28, 1865.
[96] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, March 18, 1865.
[97] New York *Herald*, July 7, 1861.
[98] *Ibid.*, August 31, 1861.
[99] *Ibid.*, September 26, 1863.

> blow should have been struck in a situation which would seem to have offered to a vigilant commander many opportunities of a kind which do not often occur.[100]

The General's stay in Wheeling led the *Intelligencer* to describe him as "a refined gentleman, yet frank, free spoken and off-hand, as the fashion is . . . [in] the West."[101]

General Rosecrans openly charged Captain H. W. Benham with the responsibility for letting John B. Floyd escape at Cotton Hill. His charges were endorsed by General Robert C. Schenck. These charges were later dismissed.[102]

March 11, 1862, Rosecrans was succeeded by General Fremont in the shake-up of commands, which threw northwest Virginia into the Mountain Department. Rosecrans was assigned to Blenker's division in the Southwest.[103] The *Commercial* declared against the injustice done "Old Rosey," as Rosecrans was called by his men, in the following language:

> While it is acknowledged his services have been conspicuous, his claims for promotion have not merely been overlooked, but just at a period when he has made himself thoroughly familiar with his Department he is deprived of his command. He is in line for Major Generalship more than any other man.
>
> . . . In relation to General Rosecrans, I submit that jealousy has probably had much to do with the neglect he has experienced. I think the Representatives of Ohio at Washington owe it to their State to see that justice is done.[104]

JACOB D. COX

General McClellan, when in command in Western Virginia, had been dissatisfied with General Jacob D. Cox in the Kanawha. He believed if Cox had done his duty Western Virginia would have been free of Con-

---

[100] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, November 27, 1861.
[101] New York *Herald*, April 5, 1862.
[102] *Ibid.*, January 10, 1862.
[103] *Ibid.*, September 26, 1863.
[104] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, March 29, 1862.

federates.[105] He had been forced back at Pocataligo, but had managed to follow General Henry Wise's retreat and hold his own position against General W. W. Loring. In 1862, according to the press, Cox successfully crushed General Henry Heath at Greenbrier, dispersed Humphrey Marshall in Mercer County, quieted Jenkins, and scoured the country from Summersville to Giles Court House.[106]

October 13, 1862, he was made commander of the District of Western Virginia. He was a young (35 years of age), cautious, skillful, executive, having the confidence of his officers and the people. He possessed detailed information of his district. With his troops he had seen service with the Army of the Potomac at Antietam.[107] He was considered a gentleman of fine attainments, "sagacious, resolute, with a sense of justice at once the terror of traitors, hidden and armed, or of . . . administration-cursing, despondent, moody refugees, who claim to be patriots.[108]

JOHN C. FREMONT

General John C. Fremont, after having been removed from his army command in Missouri, was backed by many people for an appointment because of his appeal as a public figure. An explorer and a settler of the far West, he carried with him the excitement of personage that did much to make an ordinary man great.

The *Commercial* and *Herald* were skeptical of Fremont's appointment to the Mountain Department (March, 1862). Believing his stand on slavery, rather than his military worth, had gained him the position, the *Commercial* looked upon the appointment as an experiment. Still, his prowess, industry, attachment to ideals and principles were considered equal to that of five

[105] New York *Herald*, July 22, 1862.
[106] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, October 28, 1862.
[107] New York *Herald*, October 24, 1862.
[108] *Ibid.*

men.[109] At the time of Fremont's appointment the *Herald* saw significance in an advertisement running in the Wheeling papers to the effect that the quartermaster's department would pay for no army supplies purchased by other than authorized officers.[110]

Campbell praised the effective work of Fremont, saying, "His quiet unassuming manner and his devotion to his work have impressed everybody who has had anything to do with him."[111]

By May, 1862, the *Herald* looked upon Fremont as a "General of the Good Old Times,"[112] who planned a whole campaign before moving. "His head must indeed be occupied with magnificent strategic combinations when he allows the loyal people of Western Virginia and Eastern Tennessee to be scourged by small bodies of bushwhackers and guerrillas, when he could so easily put an end to their [the people's] suffering."[113]

When Fremont left Wheeling, May 5, 1862, he had the respect of the townsmen. The *Intelligencer* remarked that he had come under a cloud, with popular sentiment against him; but he left with the expression of sentiment in his favor. His staff composed largely of foreigners, commanded the General's respect, but there seemed "to be a tinge of feeling against it on the part of the people."[114]

After the Battle of Cross Keys, June 8, 1862, where he failed to take Jackson, Fremont rapidly lost popularity, and when he refused to take a command under General John Pope, the public looked upon his refusal as a denial of his duty to serve the country.[115] Fremont's official reason for not serving under Pope was that he outranked the latter by date of his commission.[116] Yet, Fremont seemed to have the good will of his men, as

---

[109] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, April 3, 1862.
[110] New York *Herald*, April 14, 1862.
[111] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, April 29, 1862.
[112] *Ibid.*, May 5, 1862.
[113] *Ibid.*
[114] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, May 8, 1862.
[115] *Ibid.*, February 19, 1863.
[116] *Ibid.*, June 27, 1862.

indicated by the general indignation throughout his camp concerning the reshuffling of commanders, wherein he was displaced.[117]

The *Herald's* bitter comment upon Fremont's resignation was enough to bury the General as a military man. It too looked upon his action as showing a lack of patriotism. He had seized upon the occasion to make of himself a martyr. The public service was secondary to his dignity, and the radical faction in the North would probably attempt to make political capital of the issue. By June 28, Fremont was on his way out of Western Virginia, his last field as a soldier.[118]

Some agitation went on in the press for the reinstatement of Fremont to a command; but, unlike their action in the support of McClellan, the press continued to look upon Fremont as a military outcast.[119]

FRANZ SIGEL

General Franz Sigel, the former school superintendent, enjoyed the support of the German element and of the Cincinnati *Commercial*. His popularity was attested by such meetings in his honor as that held in May, 1862 at Parkersburg, where it was resolved to present him, at the close of the war, with a homestead in the state contributing the most money to such a project. All contributions over the cost of the place were to go to the general relief of soldiers.[120]

When Sigel arrived at Harper's Ferry, June 1, 1862, to assume command, he was welcomed by enthusiastic cheers from the troops. His presence was declared worth 10,000 men, which was very good since Jackson, molesting the position, was said to have 25,000.[121] The press enthusiastically greeted his appointment; the *Commercial* hailed him as a practical rather than a political gen-

[117] *Ibid.*, June 30, 1862.
[118] New York *Herald*, June 28, 1862.
[119] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, June 22, 1863.
[120] *Ibid.*, May 9, 1862.
[121] *Ibid.*, June 4, 1862; June 7, 1862.

eral,[122] one in whom both troops and public had the greatest confidence. Sigel's speech made in Cincinnati, at a sword presentation, early in 1863, in which he criticized the treatment given him in the army was attacked by the *Commercial* which implied that his personal squabbles within his command could not be charged to the nation.[123]

In March, 1864 Sigel succeeded Kelley in the Department of West Virginia. The Pittsburgh *Gazette* thought the newly appointed officer had proven himself "a good soldier in every position in which he has [had] been tried. . . ." Some believed Sigel himself had gone to Washington to urge his appointment, but Campbell thought such a report false.[124] The *Intelligencer* put forth the following requirements for a commander in West Virginia:

> Great military talent is of less consideration in this department in the movement and disposition of troops, than is a practical knowledge of the country [which Kelley possessed], a cunning and shrewdness that cannot only discover the value of mountain roads and by paths, but can also make use of them in an advantageous way, and, while it defeats the enemy, leaves our own forces situated to prevent their capture.[125]

Sigel's disastrous defeat at New Market on May 15, 1864, where he surrendered the town without firing a shot, and fell in confusion toward the Ferry,[126] caused him to be relieved of his command and ordered to report to General David Hunter, whereupon the *Intelligencer* jeered:

> Those persons who were so indefatigable for the removal of Gen. Kelley, and who prophesied so extravagantly as to what Gen. Sigel would do, must now realize that while it is one of the easiest things in the world to change commanders in a department, it is quite an other thing to improve them by so doing.

---

[122] *Ibid.*, August 2, 1862.
[123] *Ibid.*, February 27, 1863.
[124] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, February 29, 1864.
[125] *Ibid.*, March 1, 1864.
[126] New York *Herald*, July 8, 1864.

> . . . we hope the administration will directly hang him up to dry along with McClellan, Fremont and Company. Let us have no more political appointments in this war.[127]

GEORGE CROOK

Colonel, later General, George Crook made himself famous by his exploits in the Kanawha Valley. He served there, in the East, and with the Army of the Cumberland conducting himself, at all times, with the utmost valor. During February, 1864, he returned to West Virginia and fought the famous battle of Cloyds Mountain, and aided Hunter in the raid against Lynchburg and Staunton. August 30, 1864, he was placed in command of the Department of West Virginia relieving Major General Hunter. In August he fought under Sheridan in the East and was made a brevet major, February, 1865 in recognition of his service.[128]

Working in co-operation with Grant to cut the Confederate line of supplies, Crook, with the aid of Averell in one of the most brilliant raids of the war,[129] attempted early in 1864, to cut the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad.[130] His success was complete, and he was hailed with great acclaim.[131] The *Commercial* in summarizing his successes said:

> He has destroyed the Virginia and East Tennessee Railroad beyond repair for fully three months. He has roamed almost with impunity throughout the whole Department of South-western Virginia. He has outwitted General Morgan, scared "Brickwall" Jackson into his den, and backed poor McCausland into the capacious jaws of the Long Tunnel. He has captured a large number of prisoners among whom are General Jenkins and Colonel Smith, both of whom are wounded; and he has done all this with a force whose insignificance in numbers but service to render the achievement more brilliant.[132]

---

[127] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, May 23, 1864.
[128] New York *Herald*, February 26, 1865.
[129] *Ibid.*, May 29, 1864.
[130] *Ibid.*, May 14, 1864.
[131] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, May 19, 1864.
[132] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, May 21, 1864.

Even though Crook had achieved so much in West Virginia, the *Intelligencer* refused to support him for a major generalship; it declared he was already a brigadier general "and that's a plenty for him unless he does something that is a decided notch above that rank. A major generalship ought not to be as cheap as it is. . . . The people are sick, even unto disgust, with the everlasting manufacture of generals."[133] Only with a sword, a promotion that would last, could Crook obtain a major generalship.[134] Despite the attitude of the *Intelligencer,* Crook was appointed to head the Department of West Virginia. Evidently Washington thought his raid a notable achievement.[135]

Late in the same year, Colonel V. A. Witcher retaliated with his plunder raid from Lewisburg to Weston. Kelley called for reserves to guard the railroad and pursued the Confederates with his regulars, who had been doing railroad duty. The expedition failed to cause Crook to recall reinforcements from the Kanawha Valley and thereby permit General Breckenridge, of the Confederacy, to occupy the coveted salt region;[136] however, Crook was blamed locally for neglect of duty. Several days later, upon receiving his full rank of major general, the *Herald* acknowledged the honor as deserved by skillful service on the part of the talented commander and added, "No officer in our army or armies has a brighter or more honorable record than General Crook."[137]

Crook's name was again to shine in public when he, along with General Kelley, was captured from his headquarters in Cumberland. Press comment criticized such laxity of duty in the Union camp that would allow Confederates to so easily kidnap the commanding officers.

---

[133] Wheeling *Intelligencer,* June 25, 1864.
[134] *Ibid.*
[135] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial,* September 7, 1864.
[136] New York *Herald,* November 4, 1864.
[137] *Ibid.,* November 10, 1864.

WILLIAM WOODS AVERELL

General William W. Averell succeeded General R. S. Roberts as commander in the West Virginia District, due to the latter's inaction when Imboden raided the interior counties of the State. The new commander revitalized his department and moved Federal operations to the Greenbrier Valley where the Confederates maintained their stronghold. Swinging in a wide circle through Hardy, Pendleton, Highland, Pocahontas counties, he met the enemy. Severe fighting occurred at Rocky Gap, where Averell succeeded in destroying the enemy camp.[138] The second battle of Droop Mountain was fought much to the loss of both combatants.[139]

In December, 1863 Averell made his name famous by striking at the railroad between Longstreet in Kentucky and possible reinforcements from Richmond. His brilliant action brought the following comment in the *Commercial*: "It is a pity a force sufficient to have held the road for a week, and to have damaged it beyond speedily repair, could not have been sent out."[140] With the flower of the Confederate Army, Generals Early, Jones, Fitzhugh Lee, Imboden, Echols, and McCausland after him, Averell reported his command had "marched, climbed, slid and swam [*sic*] three hundred and fifty-five miles since the 8th instant [December]."[141]

The *Herald* saw the campaign as "the most delicate, difficult and dangerous, and yet the most skillfully executed raid of all the daring ones of the war."[142] It cut off Longstreet from the salt and nitre works of Southwestern Virginia and thereby greatly aided Grant.[143]

This raid greatly encouraged the cause of the *Herald* in its advocacy of increasing the cavalry in the Union army, to enable the mobility and thereby increase the effectiveness of the troops.[144]

---

138 *Ibid.*, September 10, 1863.
139 Wheeling *Intelligencer*, November 9, 1863.
140 Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, December 24, 1863.
141 New York *Herald*, December 24, 1863.
142 *Ibid.*, December 25, 1863.
143 *Ibid.*
144 *Ibid.*, December 26, 1863.

With increased popularity Averell returned to Beverly[145] while the Richmond *Examiner* blamed Generals Lee, "Mudwall" Jackson, and Imboden for the success of the Union raid.[146] Campbell saw it as "the most remarkable raid of the war," but he doubted "whether the expedition paid in any proper sense of the word."[147] His paper carried a fairly accurate account of the eighteen day maneuver.[148]

In the West Virginia Legislature, William D. Rollyson moved a resolution to thank General Averell and his command for their splendid service, but Samuel Young opposed the resolution on the grounds that his (Young's) resolution of the last session to thank General Milroy did not pass. There was some objection on the grounds that Averell was a heavy drinker, and James Carskadon said that General Averell had treated the people in Hampshire County as badly as any "rebel" general would have done. The gentleman from Hampshire explained, "Before Averell started on the Salem raid [from New Creek] he was told where he could camp on rebel premises in the county; instead of doing this, he took a wagon load of whiskey with him and encamped upon and destroyed the farms of Union men." Under such heated controversy, Rollyson withdrew his resolution.[149]

While stationed in the Potomac Valley, Averell joined in the pursuit of McCausland, who was retreating from the burning of Chambersburg (July 30, 1864). The Union officer came into the sacked town as the Confederate general retired. Immediate pursuit was made, and McCausland was punished by Averell at McConnellsburg.[150] He defeated the remainder of the retreating Southern forces at Moorefield. With Kelley's repulse of the cavalryman John McCausland and General Bradley T. Johnson at New Creek, the Potomac Valley was

---

[145] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, January 1, 1864.
[146] *Ibid.*, January 4, 1864.
[147] *Ibid.*
[148] *Ibid.*, January 7, 1864.
[149] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, January 28, 1864.
[150] New York *Herald*, August 1, 1864.

cleared of the enemy. The defeat of the Confederate forces at Moorefield ruined McCausland's supposed plan to destroy Cumberland, the Baltimore and Ohio, and sack the Kanawha Valley.[151]

By his brilliant action and effective leadership, Averell seems to have gained the confidence of his army and the civilians.

FREDERICK W. LANDER

The public was often insistent enough to obtain a man after its own heart. The Union men of West Virginia and Eastern Tennessee, through Senators John S. Carlisle and Andrew Johnson, requested that Brigadier General Frederick W. Lander, of Indian war fame, be assigned to a command in their military division. They had every confidence, and, as later events proved, justifiably so, in Lander's military ability. "If he could be allowed to pick his own men, and from [*sic*] a brigade, and let them be let loose in Virginia, the enemy would be panic stricken, and run faster than the Pahute Indians ever did."[152]

By October 15, 1861, Lander had been detailed for service to keep the Baltimore and Ohio open from Harper's Ferry to Wheeling, of which appointment the New York *Herald* observed, "This measure will keep communication intact with our forces in Western Virginia, and is an important step."[153] Lander was already known as "a gallant, able and prudent commander . . ."[154] He was to win public favor at Ball's Bluff and by his march on Romney. After exerting himself beyond human strength, he was unable to combat the pneumonia that struck him in the midst of a campaign, and he died at Paw Paw, West Virginia, March 2, 1862.[155] His death was pointed out as a lesson to the "On to Richmond

---

151 Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, August 15, 1861.
152 New York *Herald*, August 25, 1861.
153 *Ibid.*, October 15, 1861.
154 *Ibid.*, July 7, 1861.
155 *Ibid.*, March 3, 1862.

people." There was a limit to human endurance, even for a soldier, and Lander had passed that limit.[156]

McClellan, though they had quarrelled, said of him, "as a military leader, he combined a spirit of the most daring enterprise with clearness of judgment in the adaptation of means to results."[157]

ROBERT PATTERSON

Major General Robert Patterson, in command of the troops at Harper's Ferry early in 1861, was never a popular military man. In July, 1861, when McClellan had made headlines as the victor at Beverly, the press said: "It is difficult to determine what General Patterson shall be called."[158]

When Patterson was before Martinsburg his troops were commended,[159] but their commander was not praised.[160] However, the Hagerstown correspondent of the *Herald* mentioned that Patterson was criticized as being too slow, and commented, "Slow to be sure, but sure."[161] Such defenses did not save him from the popular opinion that he was too old and too slow for effective service. General Scott was reported as incensed at the commander's tardy movements.[162] Bennett's paper held: "The impression is very general that General Patterson is too slow. The position he occupies is regarded as a highly important one, and that it should be commanded by an able and skilled officer. General Fremont is the man."[163]

THE CONFEDERATES

Many brave commanders led the Southern armies in what is now West Virginia. Robert S. Garnett, John Pegram, William W. Loring, Thomas J. ("Stonewall")

---

156 Wheeling *Intelligencer*, March 4, 1862.
157 New York *Herald*, March 5, 1862.
158 *Ibid.*, July 15, 1861.
159 *Ibid.*
160 *Ibid.*, July 4, 1861.
161 *Ibid.*, July 7, 1861.
162 *Ibid.*, July 23, 1861.
163 *Ibid.*, July 2, 1861.

Jackson, Fitzhugh Lee; but of all the Confederates, General Henry A. Wise, John B. Floyd, William E. Jones, John Imboden, and Albert Gallatin Jenkins were the targets for Union hatred. Perhaps because they created the most disturbance, or because they were so closely tied to the western counties. Jenkins was a native of the region. Wise and Floyd were ex-governors of Virginia, and Jones and Imboden were notorious raiders from the Piedmont.

ALBERT GALLATIN JENKINS

General Jenkins was active, from the outbreak of the war, in the Kanawha Valley and interior counties supporting the Confederacy. The *Intelligencer* reviled against this "traitor son," and in answering the *National Republican* query as to the identity of Jenkins, confessed that he was ex-Congressman Jenkins, leader of the guerrillas since the outbreak of the war and added that he was "very wealthy." It suggested that his property be confiscated and the General hanged.[164]

Sporadic comment on Jenkins appeared in the press; but it was not until August, 1862, when General William W. Loring, commander of the Confederates in Western Virginia, ordered him to sweep around the northwest of Cheat, destroy the Baltimore and Ohio and fall on the enemy in the Kanawha, while he (Loring) advanced from Gauley, that Jenkins came in for great public condemnation.[165]

First news of the raid came from Buckhannon, when Jenkins fell upon the town and, without indecencies to the citizens occupied the place and destroyed the government stores.[166] He distributed sugar, coffee, rice, and beans to the citizens and scattered remaining stores in the street.[167] Through Weston, Glenville, Spencer, Rip-

---

[164] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, November 16, 1861.
[165] Col. Robert White, "West Virginia," in *Confederate Military History*, Vol. II (Atlanta, Georgia, 1899), p. 63.
[166] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, September 5, 1862.
[167] *Ibid.*, September 11, 1862.

ley, Ravenswood, into Ohio, and back through Pt. Pleasant to Barboursville, down the Guyandotte through Wyoming County swept his cavalry forces.[168] Ohio was much aroused. Letters asked if the "Buckeye State" were not interested enough to see "that troops are [were] sent to exterminate this band of robbers." There were proposals for sending 10,000 up the Kanawha to "clear her out."[169] The Confederates had seized on Cox's absence from the valley, with his command on the Potomac, to rout Lightburn and re-establish Confederate authority in the Kanawha Valley. Salt was the chief reason for the raid; the Kanawha had long before been stripped of agricultural products.[170]

By the end of this campaign, the deeds of Jenkins had become so awful "until he has [had] assumed the shape of Mephistophile [*sic*] himself."[171] But the General was conscientious, honorable, generous to his friends but relentless to his enemies. His estate and fortune were in Confederate bonds, and his whole life and future were wedded to the cause of slavery. "His conduct has been [was] hostile, but only toward the Union troops and officers."[172] During this raid Jenkins had become a brigadier general and the "arch type Rebel" of the press.[173] Accounts of his activities were followed in a more or less exact way by the Wheeling paper.[174]

June, 1863, Jenkins led the advance guard in the attack on Pennsylvania, during the course of which he occupied Chambersburg. His conduct toward the townspeople was supposedly very severe. After the battle of Gettysburg, in which he was wounded, Jenkins occupied himself with operations in the valleys and mountains of Western Virginia. He received his mortal wounds in the Battle of Cloyds Mountain, May, 9, 1864.

---

[168] White, *op cit.*, p. 64.
[169] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, September 9, 1862.
[170] New York *Herald*, October 24, 1862.
[171] *Ibid.*
[172] *Ibid.*
[173] *Ibid.*, May 19, 1864.
[174] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, April 6, 1863; April 7, 1863; April 9, 1863; New York *Herald*, May 19, 1864.

A very unusual procedure was taken by the Federal Court against the property of Jenkins for damages incident to his raid through Western Virginia. Two judgments were entered against the Confederate General of $100,000 for the damages at Buckhannon.[175] Another damage of $7,000 was allowed for destruction of Federal property at Weston.[176] This might be war, but the courts would see that everything was legal (?), and justice (?) was done.

HENRY WISE and JOHN B. FLOYD

June 6, 1861, General Henry A. Wise was ordered to the Kanawha, and General John B. Floyd was directed to protect the Virginia and Tennessee Railroad. It was thought their presence would rally the people of the southwestern counties to the Confederacy,[177] but no legions swarmed to their banners. They found: "The people of this section of the State [Virginia] are bitterly hostile to the people of the eastern section, and they will follow it up to the death."[178] Their campaign, while well-conducted, was destroyed in its results by their mutual enmity, which resulted in General Robert E. Lee going to the Kanawha Valley to settle the dispute,[179] and the consequent recall of Wise from command.

Wise's activities in southwestern Virginia brought forth a series of comments as early as July 9, 1861. The *Intelligencer,* in condemning the report that Wise was killed at Sissonsville (?), observed: "We think the vile old conspirator still lives. He was born to die with a rope around his neck."[180] General J. D. Cox inadvertently advertised the wiles of Wise when he declared many of the soldiers under Wise left the latter's command between Charleston and Gauley, declaring "that they were cheated into the rebel service."[181] He also was criticized

[175] Wheeling *Intelligencer,* April 8, 1864.
[176] *Ibid.,* April 11, 1864.
[177] White, *op. cit.,* p. 26.
[178] New York *Herald,* July 20, 1861.
[179] *Ibid.,* October 16, 1861.
[180] Wheeling *Intelligencer,* July 9, 1861.
[181] *Ibid.,* August 1, 1861.

for abusing the Charleston Jews.[182] Campbell observed: "For cold and wanton atrocity in robbery, theft and destruction of property his [Wise's] career has no parallel in modern times."[183] He depleted Kanawha and Jackson of all livestock, confiscated that belonging to local Union men and seemed to pay for that taken from Confederates. "Many of his followers and adherents have left the country, now that he has gone; others are ready to swear allegiance, while others ask to be let alone. They say that this wanton destruction of property is more than they bargained for."[184]

Among Southerners, Wise was criticized for his lack of knowledge concerning military affairs. His appointment was deplored, and the defeats at Charleston, Gauley Bridge, and Lewisburg were cited as proof of the case.[185] Among his own people he was defended for his "lofty courage, enthusiasm for independence, and whole-souled devotion to the cause of his native State . . ."[186]

Floyd's lack of generalship and his cruelty to local Unionists were likewise exposed and made much of in the Union press. After Rosecrans' defeat of Floyd near Summersville the *Intelligencer* stated: ". . . it appears that a victory was achieved by our arms. The secessionists fled . . . taking advantage of the darkness. . . ."[187] Floyd was the more criticized; because, as Secretary of War under President James Buchanan, he was supposed to have undermined Union strength by sabotage. It was alleged that because of this aid Jefferson Davis and his government "made this public robber a Confederate brigadier general to subjugate loyal Western Virginia."[188] November 21, 1861, the *Inteligencer* declared: Failure of rebellion in Western Virginia may be considered complete. Floyd, poor thief and traitor has stolen off with most of his command, utterly frustrated and

[182] *Ibid.*, November 29, 1861.
[183] *Ibid.*, August 7, 1861.
[184] *Ibid.*
[185] New York *Herald*, August 21, 1861.
[186] *Ibid.*
[187] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, September 13, 1861.
[188] New York *Herald*, October 16, 1861.

crippled. His course, as also that of Wise, has been one of constant humiliation. They have been beaten and worsted from the start."[189]

JOHN D. IMBODEN and WILLIAM E. JONES

Colonel John D. Imboden organized the Staunton Artillery and saw his first service with "Stonewall" Jackson at Point of Rocks.[190] He must have been a dashing figure, since he was five times married.[191] Fighting under Jackson at the Battle of Manassas and service in the Potomac Valley brought Imboden a brigadier generalship in 1863. From his camp sixteen miles beyond Moorefield he had raided nearby counties and became the despair of local Unionists.[192]

Beginning the latter part of April, 1863, Imboden moved upon the interior of the western counties,[193] while his companion in the enterprise, General William E. Jones, moved through the Eastern Panhandle to attack and destroy the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad and gather supplies for Lee's contemplated attack on Pennsylvania. Reports of attacks came from far-distant points, and the newspapers were confused as to the unheralded skirmishes at places one hundred miles apart. They were not aware that two armies were in the field. In the press the raid was called a second edition of Pegram's invasion of Kentucky.[194]

General J. A. Lightburn, then in Wheeling, assumed direction of the local militia.[195] The people were surprised at the bold movement which the *Intelligencer* characterized:

> The raid into the Monongahelia Valley far surpasses for supreme boldness of design and celrity [celerity] of execution the famous raid made by Stuart to Chambers-

---

189 Wheeling *Intelligencer*, November 21, 1861.
190 Festus P. Summers, *The Baltimore and Ohio in the Civil War* (New York, 1939), p. 67.
191 *Dictionary of American Biography*, Vol. IX, p. 460 f.
192 Wheeling *Intelligencer*, November 17, 1862.
193 New York *Herald*, May 20, 1863.
194 Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, April 29, 1863.
195 Wheeling *Intelligencer*, April 29, 1863.

> burg. A glance at the map shows how much greater distance has been traversed, and if we consider the starting place it seems almost incredible that horses could endure the fatigue of such a jaunt. Undoubtedly they seize all the horses they can find, and thus keep up a pretty good supply of fresh horses. It is but reasonable to believe that many accessions have been made to their ranks, as there were without doubt numerous companies organized in different parts of the country ready to join them.[196]

The people of the area hoped, without fulfillment, that General Benjamin S. Roberts would offer resistance. Local defense, while unorganized, was often bold. Jones complimented the defenders of Fairmont Bridge by saying he never saw "such a set to fight anywhere."[197] False stories spread that Wheeling had been occupied, that Harper's Ferry and Winchester captured by General Fitzhugh Lee, and that Stonewall Jackson with 30,000 men was marching into northwest Virginia. The *Commercial* observed: "After all the scare is over, there are are many incidents very serious, amusing and ridiculous, which might be related, but time and space forbid."[198]

As an immediate result of the raid the *Intelligencer* insisted that Western Virginia be given a cavalry of 5,000 men for its protection, and called upon Governor Francis H. Pierpont to impress such a need upon the Washington authorities.[199]

Speculations occurred as to the motive of the raid. The Philadelphia *Inquirer* believed it was planned to destroy the Baltimore and Ohio, demoralize the region and influence the coming elections or see that they were not held.[200] The *Intelligencer* did not agree with this opinion, but held that the invasion was not to do anything "especially," except "To get men, horses, cattle and general plunder, to do harm to the Union cause in every possible way to demoralize the loyal sentiment by

[196] *Ibid.*
[197] *Ibid.*, May 9, 1863.
[198] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, May 7, 1863.
[199] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, May 12, 1863.
[200] *Ibid.*, May 19, 1863.

wasting and pillaging and terrifying the country; to distract attention from other quarters by making us concentrate troops to meet them; and, finally, they came to get employment for a surplus of troops which they could not use advantageously any where else."[201]

An anaylsis of Southern sympathy gained from the excursion into Western Virginia was that Calhoun, Gilmer, and Braxton counties were unified in the cause of the South. Marion was strongly Southern, Harrison Southern "to a degree," Barbour had "some good feeling," Upshur was "very unsound," Lewis had a majority "sound" but a "rampant minority" for the Union, Doddridge was a hot bed of "fanaticism and disloyalty," Ritchie was not much, if any, better, Monongalia and Preston had very little Southern feeling.[202]

Imboden and Jones had made good their objectives and retired by the middle of May, but the newspapers continued to give them space. The *Herald* advertised that Imboden had captured 1,200 Union troops, much baggage and stores along the railroad during 1863.

After the failure of William (Mudwall) Jackson to invade the new state the *Intelligencer* pronounced the invasion of West Virginia a failure. "The attempt has been going on for some thirty months now. For over a year past it has been carried on in a small way by the so-called 'refugee' from this section, under the lead of such fellows as Imboden, Jenkins, and Jackson."[203]

THOMAS J. (STONEWALL) JACKSON

General Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson was a native of Western Virginia, but bitterness and invective seem not to have been cast on his actions to the extent that they were leveled at Floyd and Jenkins. After the death of the noted Confederate leader, May 10, 1863, all papers united in praising him. The *Intelligencer*

[201] *Ibid.*
[202] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, June 9, 1863.
[203] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, November 10, 1863.

said the heroic deeds related of him would fill a volume. "They all hinge upon the sincerity of his zeal, his personal bravery, his dash and courage in military operation, and the remarkable influence he exercised over his men."[204] Three days later it said, "So profound grief would not have been felt at the South for the death of any man, except, perhaps, Lee."[205]

The *Herald* agreed that Jackson was the most noble leader developed by the war and cited him as "a universal favorite in the rebel armies, and popular even in our own." It characterized Bull Run as "his victory"; his operations in the Shenandoah Valley, "masterly"; at Chickahominy he "turned the tide"; at Antietam his actions were "brilliant"; and at Antietam he was the "saviour of Lee."[206]

In Cincinnati the *Commercial* felt that he [Jackson] was regarded as far the most dangerous military enemy of the United States, the satisfaction felt that he has fought his last battle, will be tempered by a sentiment of sorrow that so brave and capable a man should have fallen." It admitted also that, "A curious regard was felt for him even in our own [Union] army, and among those who had oftenest fought the legions he led."[207]

Jackson went through the battles with his personality undimmed. There were no lustful cries of reprisal against his estate; there were no rejoicings at his death. He passed from the swiftly moving stage of war, leaving behind the impression of a man who lived life well. It is to the credit of the press that they recognized a great soldier and a greater man had passed that day.

ROBERT E. LEE

General Robert E. Lee during the early fall of 1861 attempting to destroy the Union forces, under General

[204] *Ibid.*, May 16, 1863.
[205] *Ibid.*, May 19, 1863.
[206] New York *Herald*, May 14, 1863.
[207] Cincinnati *Daily Commercial*, May 14, 1863.

J. J. Reynolds at Cheat Mountain,[208] did not impress the newspapers with his results. At this time the New York *Herald* with the significant head "Who Is General Lee?" ran the following comment:

> When he joined the rebel cause great faith and confidence were placed in what was considered his super-excellent military knowledge, and his active experience in Mexico and elsewhere. Relying upon this he was sent to take command of the rebels that were to combat with Rosecrans, and failing as he has done, in this, his first battle, the prestige of his great name is gone perhaps for ever. Success begets confidence, but failure is sure to bring a loss of it along with the other disasters.[209]

Lee's defeat by General Reynolds was supposed to have demoralized a great portion of the Confederate army, "as so much was expected from him by officers, men and civilians."[210] Except for a brief period in the Kanawha Valley, Lee had no other direct command in West Virginia. Little did the papers realize that several years later two words: "Lee Surrenders" would bring such relief and happiness to the thousands of the North and sad rejoicing to the South. In Wheeling the news was to be on every tongue. "The news did not come so suddenly and unexpectedly as the fall of Richmond, and hence did not produce much outward displays of hilarity, but the feeling was none the less decisive and hearty."[211]

West Virginia had seen four years of campaigning. The people had suffered much from lawless bands as well as enemy invasions. Prudent, foolish, skilled, awkward, heroic and blundering leadership had been their lot. The old order had changed. Free soil, free labor and a new state had been achieved in the struggle. For much of the new state success she could thank the Union press. Confederate and Union brethren returned to their

---

[208] Douglas Southall Freeman, *Robert E. Lee* (New York, 1934-1936), Vol. I, pp. 541-576.
[209] New York *Herald*, September 18, 1861.
[210] *Ibid.*
[211] Wheeling *Intelligencer*, April 11, 1865.

hundreds of neighborhoods all over the devastated region and took up the broken threads of their lives, to weave together, as a new people under a new state, what the years of strife had torn asunder.

Swords were beaten into plowshares.

Preservation and Restoration of Historic West Virginia*

By Charles J. Milton

When many of our ancestors decided to leave their comfortable homes in the East to develop the country of the setting sun beyond the Allegheny Mountains, they brought with them not only their personal belongings but their culture as well. All of these people were not hardy, uncouth pioneers, but many were genteel people of culture and refinement. Consequently, along the Atlantic seaboard from Maine to Florida and as far west as Illinois, our early American public buildings, houses, plantations, taverns, bridges, etc., represent the greatest, concrete heritage we have in America today. This culture of the past we can see, study, admire, and appreciate through an understanding and knowledge of its significance.

West Virginia is steeped in the history of the past and until 1863, the history of Virginia is our history. In reality our state is not a comparatvely new one but a very old state filled with many historic shrines and buildings throughout its length and breadth.

What is being done today by our state in the way of preserving a visual record of this greatest of all concrete heritages, early American architecture? So far as I have been able to ascertain, very little. The state of Ohio, for instance, is far ahead of us in this field. The Ohio legislature sets aside considerable sums from time to time for the development of a system of state museums and for the preservation and restoration of historical places throughout the state. One of their projects is the

* Summary of an illustrated lecture given at the annual meeting of the West Virginia Historical Society, Charleston, November 18, 1944.

gradual restoration of the whole town of Zoar which is fast becoming another Williamsburg.

It has occurred to me that many of our houses and buildings in West Virginia, representing the best tradition of early American architecture, are slowly but steadily disappearing. A visual record of these places should be started immediately by the Department of Archives and History or by some other department of the state which would have jurisdiction over such a project. I can walk into the State Chamber of Commerce of Virginia and secure for 15 cents an 8"x10" glossy print of practically every historic spot in that state.

Many centuries ago an ancient philosopher said, "One picture is worth 10,000 words." It seems to me, therefore, in the very near future, our state should make a comprehensive survey of all historic places, securing data and photographic records of each place. Scale drawings of the most important houses and buildings should be made, also. These photographs would be of inestimable value as records, also for state publicity purposes and for individual needs.

Through the efforts of the Mansion Museum, operated by Oglebay Institute at Oglebay Park, Wheeling, West Virginia, a real start along these lines has already been made. The Museum has in its possession a complete photographic record of every historic and outstanding post-colonial building in the Wheeling area and Ohio County. These records include 8"x10" glossy prints with all available information concerning each in the lower left hand corner. The negatives for these pictures are catalogued and filed. From these prints 35 mm slides have been made. These are used by the Museum for lectures on early Wheeling architecture and are available as supplementary material for the teaching of local history in the grade schools. The photographs accompanying this article show various periods of American architecture in buildings and homes that were or still are to be found in the Wheeling area.

First Presbyterian Church. built in 1831. Land donated by Noah Zane in 1816. The Zane family founded Wheeling. The official clock of the city was in the tower until the State House was completed. The many storied tower and Ionic portico recall the Classic churches of Charleston, South Carolina.

One end of the ball room, Monument Place. The exquisite detail of this room is characteristic of the style named after the Brothers Adam, Royal 18th Century architects. It is on a par with that found in the late 18th century houses of Salem, Boston, and other cities of the Atlantic seaboard.

"Shepherd Hall," now known as "Monument Place," built in 1798 by Col. Moses Shepherd. A good example of Georgian architecture.

This old house that is so definitely of the southern plantation type was built in 1814. It is "Old Trails Farm," the home of Mr. and Mrs. Julian McFadden Sweeney, Wheeling, West Virginia.

The West Virginia State Historical Society and the Department of Archives and History should be vitally interested in the preservation and restoration of historic buildings and in the further development and enlarging of the State Museum as well as the completion of a visual record of "Historic West Virginia." All this could be made possible by a reasonable appropriation of funds by the State Legislature.

West Virginians in the American Revolution

Assembled and Edited by ROSS B. JOHNSTON

The sources of this material are from the files of the Pension Office at Washington from various county records, from notes of patriotic societies, principally the Daughters of the American Revolution, Sons of the American Revolution, Sons of the Revolution, and from a large miscellaneous group of published and private sources. Corrections and additions to this list will receive the careful attention of the editor.

ROSE, ISAAC
Service—Virginia Va. No. 16402 No. W. 5713

Born, 1753; died February 17, 1829. Enlisted in Monongalia County in 1777 and served until 1780 under Captain Scott in the Thirteenth Virginia Regiment, Continental Establishment, under Colonel Gibson and General Hand. Pension was granted the soldier in Nicholas County in 1820. After his death his widow was granted pension, which was received until her death, November 30, 1843, in Braxton County. The other heirs, William, James, Hannah, Ezekiel, Charles, and Amelia, filed application for unpaid amounts in 1846. Among persons mentioned in this case are Margaret Johnson and David Johnson as supporting witnesses.

ROSEBROUGH, JOHN
Service—Penn. Va. No. 16432 No. W. 11172 and B. L. Wt. 93085

Enlisted in Cumberland County, Pennsylvania in 1775, in the company of Captain Ripley in the Sixth Pennsylvania Regiment, commanded by Colonel Irvin, Colonel Hartley, and General Thompson. Took part in the engagements at Saratoga, Three Rivers and at Ticonderoga, at which latter place he was wounded. Was also engaged on much guard duty. Thomas Dann, a British soldier of Burgoyne's army, who had been captured at Saratoga, made affidavit that John Rosebrough was one of the guards while he was a prisoner. Another supporting affiant was Jonathan Lukens.

Soldier received pension in Hampshire County, in 1833, which was suspended, but later restored. He married Arsenath McGuire of Hardy County, Virginia, in 1836, and died, June 27, 1840. Bounty land warrant for 160 acres was later issued for Rosebrough as a private in Colonel Adam's regiment of the Pennsylvania line.

ROUSH, (Rouch), JONAS
Service—Virginia Va. No. 12720 (Transferred to Ohio) No. S. 4785

Born, Holman Fort, Shenandoah County, Virginia, September 1763; moved to Mason County, Virginia, 1798, where he died in 1850. He enlisted in Shenandoah County as a substitute for his brother, Henry, and served three months in the company of Captain Al, Aul or Awl in Colonel Bird's or Burt's Regiment, and was transferred to Colonel Darke's Virginia Regiment. He was at the siege of Yorktown, and while on his way to Winchester, Virginia, with prisoners, was taken sick at Fredericksburg, and discharged.

He was granted pension in Mason County, Virginia, in 1833. His wife, having died in 1837, he removed to Meigs County, Ohio, to live with his daughter. Among supporting data is that filed by Michael Roush, George Roush, and Daniel Miller.

ROW (Rowe or Roe), JOHN
Service—New Jersey Va. No. 1794 No. W. 5726

Enlisted in 1779 in Morris County, New Jersey, in the company of Captain Cox in the Third Jersey Regiment, commanded by Colonel Francis Barber, General Sullivan, and General Lafayette, and took part in the battles at Springfield, New Jersey, and Jamestown, Virginia. He remained in service until 1781.

Soldier was born in 1759 or 1761 and died September 29, 1829. He was married in Essex County, New Jersey March 27, 1779, and lived there until the spring of 1784. Then he moved to New York City in 1790, then to Fayette County, Pennsylvania, until 1796, at which time he moved to Harrison County, Virginia. His wife, Susannah, was 55 years old in 1820. The children of John and Susannah Rowe were: Clarissa, June 18, 1782; Lewis, August 23, 1784; Elizabeth, April 7, 1788; Edward, May 18, 1791; John, February 6, 1794; James, February 1, 1797. Soldier received pension in Harrison County, in 1818, which was suspended but later restored. His widow received pension in 1839. Supporting data was filed by D. Cane, John Long, and Humphrey Faires.

ROWAN, JOHN

The Rev. John Rowan was born in Maryland, April 12, 1749. He enlisted in the Revolutionary Army and was run down and trampled by British cavalry in the battle of Brandywine. He married Elizabeth Howard of Ann Arundel County, Maryland, moved to Randolph County, Virginia, April 12, 1809, and died at Beverley, December 29, 1833. His wife died February 19, 1844. Their children were: John, Thomas, Joseph, Francis, William, Nancy, Elizabeth, Bethany (Bathany), and Labbannah.

RUCKER, HENRY
Service—Virginia Va. No. 5059 No. S. 6278

Born in Maryland in 1744. Service in the Revolutionary War under Captains Booth, Pindal and Gregory. Applied for a pension in Harri-

son County, Virginia, in 1832, which was issued in 1835 but was later dropped as not coming under the provisions of Act of June 7, 1832. Mentions a brother, John Rucker.

RUMSEY, JAMES

Rumsey, who won fame as the inventor of the steamboat, lived at "Bath," now Berkeley Springs, and later at Shepherdstown, Jefferson County, Virginia, and had seen service as a Revolutionary War soldier.

RUNION, ELIJAH

Service—Virginia No. R. 9079

Born in Shenandoah County, Virginia, July 11, 1757. There he resided until 1781-82, when he removed to Ohio County, then to Harrison County, in 1815, and then to Mason and Jackson Counties. He enlisted May 17, 1778, and saw service under Captains J. Kar, Swearingen, Colonels Gibson, Zane, Shepherd, and General McIntosh. Under Captain Rader Milderbock he took part in the expedition against the Indians at Munsie Town. He applied for a pension while living in Jackson County, in 1833, which was rejected, apparently for failure to show sufficient service. Supporting data was filed by Sam Lenner and Jesse Carpenter.

RUSH, CONRAD

Enlisted under Captain Shepherd in 1776. Was taken prisoner and was killed or died in prison, February 15, 1777.

RUSSELL, JEFFREY

Before the Superior Court of Law in Cabell County, Virginia, October 9, 1811, Russell testified that he had enlisted for three years in 1776 in Mecklenberg County, Virginia, and had served as a private in the Fourteenth Virginia Regiment until December 28, 1779, when he was discharged at Philadelphia. He had failed to keep his discharge when applyng for compensation, and had received no land warrant. His claim was supported by Mark Russell. On October 31, 1811, he was issued land bounty Warrant No. 6068 for three years' service as a private.

RUSSELL, NICHOLAS

Was a private under Captain Shepherd. He was taken prisoner but was soon exchanged. He served out his enlistment, which ended October 1, 1778.

RUSSELL, THOMAS

Service—Virginia Va. No. 1036 No. S. 38345

Enlisted early in 1777 as a private in the Twelfth Virginia Regiment, in the company of Captain Mitchell under Colonel James Wood. Served until the end of the war when he was discharged at Winchester, after taking part in the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, Mon-

mouth, and Guilford Courthouse, and the siege and capture of Cornwallis' army at Yorktown.

Soldier applied for pension in Berkeley County, Virginia, June 10, 1820, at which time he was 64 years old. On file is the affidavit of Captain Joseph Swearington, late captain in the Virginia Continental Line, which states that Russell was a brave and valuable soldier. Pension was granted.

RUTHERFORD, ROBERT
Service—Virginia Ohio—9735 No. S. 38341

Resided in Shenandoah County, Virginia, at the outbreak of the Revolution. Enlisted as a private and wagoner under Captain James Wallace in the Virginia Line in regiment commanded by Colonel Benford and took part in the campaign in North and South Carolina.

Applied for pension in Clark County, Ohio, in 1818, which was granted in 1819. Pension was discontinued in 1822, but in 1825, at which time the soldier was living in Cabell County, Virginia, pension was restored. At that time, the soldier was 63 years old and his wife 67.

RYAN, JOHN
Service—Virginia Va. No. 16889 No. S. 18584

Born in Hampshire County, 1759, and while living on Patterson's Creek enlisted in the Revolutionary Army in August 1778 or 1779. Served twelve months under Captains Abraham Johnson, Josiah Swearingen, and Richardson under Colonels Harrison of Rockingham County, Morrow of Berkeley County, Gibson, and G. D. Camden, Generals McIntosh and Broadhead. He took part in the military activities at Fort McIntosh and Fort Lawrence. He received discharges from both Captain Swearingen and Captain Richardson. Soldier received pension in Randolph County, Virginia, in 1833. Supporting affidavits were filed by Adam See or Cee, The Rev. Thomas Collett, Thomas O. Williams, and Ely Butcher.

RYLAND, NICHOLAS N. (Captain)
Service—Pennsylvania ,Va. No. 17930 No. S. 38346

A resident of Pennsylvania, but enlisted in Baltimore, Maryland, April, 1777, and served until November 15, 1783, as private, cornet of horse, lieutenant and captain under Captains Legur and Stake in the Third Pennsylvania Regiment, and in Pulaski's Legion, under Colonel Butler and Count Pulaski. He was in the engagements at Egg Harbor, Monmouth, Savannah, and at the siege and capture of Yorktown. He received pension while living in Lewis and Harrison Counties, Virginia. Supporting affidavits were filed in this case by Patrick and John Handline, and Paul Bentalon.

RYMER, GEORGE
Service—Virginia Va. No. 27870 No. S. 9469

Born in England in 1755 and emigrated to America in 1772. While

living in Augusta County, Virginia, he enlisted in 1780 and 1781 and served nine months as a private under Captains Gibbons, Bell and Buckhannon in the Virginia militia commanded by Colonels Moffett and Vance. Took part in various marches and guard duty.

Applied for and received pension while living in Pendleton County, 1834. Supporting evidence submitted by Jack Homer, Jacob Seybert, and Smith Thompson. Pensioner died November 30, 1845.

SALTER, JAMES

Service—Virginia Va. No. 19803 No. S. 41125

Enlisted in 1776 in Ohio County, Virginia, in the company commanded by Captain Silas Zane in the Thirteenth Virginia Regiment under Colonel Russell. He was later transferred to the Ninth Regiment, under Colonel D. Campbell. Took part in the battles of Germantown and Brandywine, and remained in service until 1780.

In Ohio County in 1826 he applied for pension. Captain John Mills of Ohio County testified as to his services as did Captain Uriah Springer of Fayette County, Pennsylvania, and W. C. Chapping. Pension was granted in 1827 which was transferred to Scioto County, Ohio, in 1838. His pension application refers to his wife, aged 84 in 1826, at which time the soldier was 72. Reference is made to a nephew, William, living in Fayette County, Pennsylvania, to whom the soldier owed money.

Book Reviews

LEE'S LIEUTENANTS: A STUDY IN COMMAND. By Douglas Southall Freeman. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, $5.00 per volume. Volume II, CEDAR MOUNTAIN TO CHANCELLORSVILLE. Pp. 760; Volume III, GETTYSBURG TO APPOMATTOX. Pp. 862.

FIRST WITH THE MOST, FORREST. By Ralph Selph Henry. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company. Pp. 558. $4.00.

FIGHTING JOE HOOKER. By Walter H. Hebert. Bobbs-Merrill Company. Pp. 366. $3.50.

JOHN C. CALHOUN, NATIONALIST. By Charles M. Wiltse. Bobbs-Merrill Company. Pp. 447. $3.75.

THE USE OF PRESIDENTIAL POWER. By George Fort Milton. Boston: Little Brown and Company. Pp. 349. $3.00.

It is an interesting fact that while we are in the crisis of the greatest war the world has ever known, and a flood of books about that war, good, bad and indifferent, is pouring from the presses, a considerable number of other books, historical, biographical, fictional, about an earlier war, should command an important place in the interest of the reading public. What is there about that War of Secession, fought so long ago that

> "Hardly a man is now alive,
> Who remembers that famous day and year,"

yet it still continues high in the popular interest while books about World War I are never read? Is it not due to the fact that nothing definite came out of the War of 1917, while from the dreadful War of 1861 came THE NATION, that essential never before achieved, which has made possible today's proud place in the sun—and its imperative responsibility.

Chief among the new books dealing with those years must of course be put the concluding volumes of Douglas Freeman's great double series, *R. E. Lee* and *Lee's Lieutenants*. One stands in awe before them as one does before the Bayeaux Tapestry, thinking of the stupendous labor that has gone into their making, the long searching in many places, the meticulous attention to detail, the weighing and the balancing of this against that, before the words were put down on paper. Here the War lives again, and the men who fought the War, and fought each other, rugged individualists as they were. You see them win impossible victories, or fail in as startling fashion, and you cannot help being greatly proud that your land produced such sons.

And Dr. Freeman has justly stated a fact about the equally gallant men who fought against them, which, as he himself points out, "in Southern studies of Gettysburg it is more often assumed than stated," that "The Army of the Potomac fought well in every battle when the blunders of rash and incompetent commanders did not paralyze or counteract the effort of the men. At Gettysburg the magnificent Federal Divisions had strong ground, interior lines, the sense of fighting for home, knowledge of combat, and the intelligent, courageous leadership of George Gordon Meade, of Winfield Scott Hancock, and of other wholly capable captains. Vigorous and experienced as was Lee's Army it could not prevail over that adversary." It would be better, far better, and lead to a clearer understanding of that great conflict, if all debate about it could be conducted on that high level.

With so much to praise in this great series it may seem captious to point out what seems to me the weakness in Dr. Freeman's distribution of praise and blame. In my review of Vol. I (WEST VIRGINIA HISTORY, July 1943) recalling his question in the "Foreword": "In holding the light on Lee had one put in undeserved shadow the many excellent soldiers in his Army?" I stated that "It is hard to avoid feeling that to him that gallant Army of Northern Virginia was made up of the King who could do no wrong and all the rest who could do little else." A careful scrutiny of these two volumes confirms that opinion. Take his treatment of the Gettysburg campaign and Longstreet's part in it. To some who have spent much time in the study of those days the blame for the failure of the invasion is wholly Lee's, as he himself admitted when the battle was over. It illustrates, in several ways, the fact that Lee had weakness, as well as strength. Certainly, and strangely, he never seems to have sensed the almost continental scope of the War. So when Longstreet sought to persuade him, after Chancellorsville, to send him and his corps to join Johnston and thus compel Grant to lift the siege of Vicksburg, he could not see the force of that move, which might have changed the whole course of the War. Freeman seeks to explain this refusal thus: "Face to face with Hooker's army, which numerically was much superior, Lee did not feel that he could safely divide his forces." What had he to fear from Hooker after the latter's disastrous display of inefficiency a few days before? So in spite of Longstreet's protests the gallant and tragic march to Gettysburg was begun, while Grant went on to free the Mississippi and cut the Confederacy in two. And when Gettysburg was reached and the battle was begun, Lee did not see, as the man with the final responsibility should see, that his orders were carried out with exactness and dispatch, this again in spite of the fact that Longstreet, who was to carry them out, had protested their issue. So while Ewell moved in the morning as directed, Longstreet dallied till the afternoon. The result was Pickett's charge, as gallant and as futile as Balaclava. When one remembers how Grant hung on to Meade in the dreadful days from the Wilderness on, to see that orders were carried out, one sees what was missing in command at Gettysburg.

Then, among "the exterior factors" which Freeman gives for the failure of the campaign "was the limitation imposed by the factor of time. The campaign was fought while the Army was living off the country and was without supply lines to Virginia. Much of the collection of supplies had to be undertaken with little cavalry." But where in the land was there a section richer in what would support an Army than the fat and fertile Cumberland Valley? And where was the cavalry? Gone on a mad adventure with Stuart—*with Lee's permission?* As Freeman points out one of the factors in the failure of Pickett's charge was the shortness of ammunition for the batteries in support. Yet the charge was begun and men died whom the Confederacy never could replace. We are told in Volume I that Beauregard "shows a lack of the sense of logistics." It would seem that this lack was very much in evidence in Lee, not only here, and in the starving months at the end, but throughout the War. The South had not yet begun to face the pinch at Gettysburg that it was afterward to know, but there was no reason for this shortage of supplies then, except "a lack of the sense of logistics." There are certain questions about Lee which Dr. Freeman does not seem to face in his otherwise great study. Should Lee have begun the campaign with his logistical problems unsolved? Or without an understanding of the grand strategy involved in the choice he had to make between invasion of the North and the relief of Vicksburg? Longstreet may have been—and was—undoubtedly less cooperative than he should have been, but the final responsibility was that of the Commanding General—who was not Longstreet! Dr. Freeman has put us all in his debt through the exacting labors by which he has brought together the great mass of material which has entered into the shaping of these books. It remains for some other scholar to adjust in fairer measure the balance between Lee and his lieutenants. Not all the glory was his, nor the blame theirs. It seems almost unnecessary to say that the books are adequately indexed and the bibliography splendidly complete.

Bobbs-Merrill have added another significant contribution to their long and important list of Civil War titles in Ralph Selph Henry's *First With the Most, Forrest.* Mr. Henry has already published through them two books of value, *The Story of the Confederacy* and *The Story of Reconstruction.* In this latest study he gives us a very graphic picture of a very great soldier, who contrary to the Army tradition of necessity, never saw West Point, but who nevertheless succeeded in defying every dictum of West Point, as to how battles should be won, while at the same time winning them, in astounding fashion. In fact General Joseph E. Johnston pronounced him "The greatest soldier the War produced." Forrest left a successful business career to enter the Confederate Army as a private and the end found him a Lieutenant-general. He was the last Confederate general east of the Mississippi to surrender, and he followed Lee's example in his farewell counsel to his soldiers that "It is our duty so far as it is in our power to do so, to cultivate friendly feelings toward those with whom we have

so long contested, and heretofore so widely but honestly differed." Mr. Henry treats Forrest as that honest soldier would have wanted to be, honestly but critically; and not least of all dispelling the silly tradition that he was uncouth enough to say "Fustest with the mostest." It is a book not to be overlooked by those who would know that period and one of the great figures in it. The notes and bibliography are very valuable.

In *Fighting Joe Hooker* Mr. Hebert has done the best he could with such a subject, but no one could make Hooker other than he was—a boastful incompetent who failed in the hour of his great opportunity. Appointed to a post of command largely as the result of political pressure, he did well at first in executing other men's plans, so well as to win the praise of Lincoln, desperately seeking a man who would fight. But Lincoln held on to him too long, for Lincoln always had a weakness for lame dogs, as witness his toleration of "Billy" Herndon and many another, to his cost. As he was to find out that dreadful night after Chancellorsville, as he walked the floor of his room, all night, in agony. And Hooker also seems to have won the confidence of his men, for the foot soldier loves the glamorous in his general, as we are seeing again in this War. At Chancellorsville, despite Lincoln's warning as to what he expected of him, Hooker failed dismally —and in a way that Mr. Hebert does not explain, and was removed, fortunately, from command, before the decisive issue of Gettysburg. Grant had little confidence in him, an opinion that was confirmed after his folly in the bloody and careless movement after Bragg at Ringgold; and it would seem that the final judgment of history about him was anticipated in Dana's report to Stanton about that event: "The first great fault in this campaign occurred at this place." The book, however, with its careful study of many battles and movements is one that has definite value in the literature of the War. And especially so as a study of command.

It may seem strange to include a life of John C. Calhoun in a group of books dealing with the War of Secession, but who had more to do than he with putting the adjective "inevitable" before the word "conflict" in the story of those years. This book covers only the first half of his life, reaching only to the point where he ceased to be the apostle of Nationalism and became the prophet of Secession, while Webster was making at the same time an about-turn in the opposite direction. That change in direction is not new in our political history, nor have we seen the last of it. How else are we to define the Republican Party's espousal of State's Rights, while its historic opposition, after laying down the banners so valiantly defended for more than a century, has swung into a course, which if long continued, can end only in Authoritarian Statism, a condition poles apart from the political order dreamed of and planned for by Jefferson. As a history of party change and the tale of a most vital personality, well and ably told, the book has great value in a day filled with change centering around vital personalities.

Calhoun came from that upland country of South Carolina that gave us Andrew Jackson, and of that same obdurate, hard-fisted stock, the Scotch-Irish, who have had such a profound effect on the shaping of our history; possibly because, as the author believes, "they were not a people to be long content in any community guided by other hands than their own." And as has been frequently seen in the second generation from poverty of that race he had a profound philosophical interest in the common man, but he did not wish to be one. This perhaps was the reason why the common man never gave him the help he needed in his struggle for the Presidency and which forced him in the end to become the champion of a group that was as far removed from the common man as any in America. So, Mr. Wiltse declares, "Calhoun remained in 1828 what he had been in 1812—at heart a metaphysician rather than a practitioner of politics; and it was perhaps inevitable that he should seek a metaphysical solution. It was equally inevitable that the solution must be ineffective in practice because it rested upon principles which the common man could not grasp." The solution was Nullification, and the end of its dissemination the Civil War. The book ends as Calhoun's philosophy had reached its final expression. It is to be hoped that the author will carry on the tale in another volume.

But there was more that a philosophical delusion in the madness of the man. He was profoundly ambitious, and reckless in the quest of his ambition. As a very young member of Congress he joined with Clay to force Congress to the War of 1812. He pushed himself into a place of leadership in party politics and Monroe made him Secretary of War when he was thirty-four. Eight years later he became Vice President. "At 43 he could boast an achievement equalled by few men in American history." Then he broke wtih Jackson, and the glittering prize of the Presidency, for which he had long striven, was never his. "His appeal was to the middle class, as Jackson's was to the conscious proletariat, but the machine politics of Crawford and Van Buren knew no class distinctions." To the end of his life Jackson regretted that he had not hanged John C. Calhoun. Perhaps he was right in that regret!

Again the reader who would pursue further the study of this earlier Calhoun is indebted to the author for his very full notes and bibliography.

In *The Use of Presidential Power* George Fort Milton, whose studies of the Civil War period have been read by many, deals in this new volume, in a popular and interesting way—as in all his books—with a matter which is likely to attract more attention from thinking men as its implications are more widely understood. At least it is to be hoped that it will. For one who wants a general introduction to the problems involved, this book is to be warmly recommended. Before he is through he will at least understand how vastly the Presidential power has been extended in the hands of strong men, and how great a threat the continuance of that extension offers to that delicate bal-

ance of power between the executive, legislative and judicial elements of government which the Fathers imagined when they shaped the Constitution. It is to be regretted for the guidance of him who would pursue the matter further that Mr. Milton has omitted all notes and has furnished only a short "bibliographical note."

A very satisfactory opening chapter gives a brief narrative of the Constitutional debates on the subject of the Executive, which was followed by a very slow development of the idea of the Executive at the hands of the earlier Presidents. Jackson brought the same decisive methods to the problems of the White House that he had employed in the camp, and the first magnification of the office took place under him. There followed the years when the great men in government were at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue and Congress overshadowed the Presidents. But in Lincoln's hands the process was sharply reversed. Mr. Milton's treatment of the story of the growth of the Presidential power during his administration is tremendously revealing, and should not be overlooked by any student of the Great Conflict. Further it will shed much light on what has been happening in Washington in recent years. That Lincoln was able to do so the author believes was due to his great skill in handling public opinion. "His almost intuitive understanding of the tangled moods of the people is his best title to greatness. . . . As Commander in Chief, he found and used the powers without whose employment his Presidency might have been almost as flabby as Buchanan's. Militarily, he earned a postgraduate degree in the school of command. As Chief of Foreign Relations he avoided wars abroad. His success in both roles stemmed out of his genius as Chief of Public Opinion."

Equally important, Mr. Milton finds, is the use of the same ability by Franklin Roosevelt. The last chapters of the book are given to the story of how far he has gone beyond Lincoln in centering power in the White House. It is interesting to note that he believes that in doing this the President's "service as Chief of Party has been quite deficient."

Morgantown, West Virginia WILLIAM E. BROOKS

THE PLAIN PEOPLE OF THE CONFEDERACY. By Bell Irvin Wiley. Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1943. Pp. 104. $1.50.

Mr. Wiley, author of one of the most engaging, not to say most important, books on the fighting soldier of the Southern Confederacy and of an excellent work on the Negro of that period, here presents published lectures on these and on one other phase of Confederate life. Entertaining, urbane, and penetrating, these three lectures, which are the fifth series of the Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History to be published, tell of the humble folk of the embattled South: the soldier, the folks at home, and the Negro. The first

and last lectures are condensations from the author's previous works. While they do not present much material that is new it is pleasant to have in this brief form the conclusions of the earlier, full-length works, and, combined with the entirely new presentation of the civilians of the time, they create richly a general pattern of all the plain people.

It is only for those who are unfamiliar with Mr. Wiley's historical method and style that anything need be said about the mode of treatment followed in each of these three sketches. Mr. Wiley surveys the food and clothing problems, the morale and diversions of each group. Other aspects of life as experienced by the soldier are examined: relationships with officers, morals, disease, and homesickness. In the case of the Negro, in addition to general problems, his attitude, his discipline, and the impact of the war upon him are discussed.

As Mr. Wiley did in *The Life of Johnny Reb*, he again reveals the soldier of the South as poorly schooled (though likely to have in his group one or more well educated comrades), simple, full of the hopes and fears and courage of ordinary soldiers everywhere. He was neither the beardless boy nor the hoary ancient of romantic Southern letters, but generally between eighteen and thirty-five. He was given as much to going A.W.O.L. or of deserting altogether as any soldier anywhere. Characteristically vocally belligerent about his food and the ennui of camp life, he nevertheless preserved his sense of humor.

The lecture on Johnny Reb, as well as the other lectures, abounds in rich quotations, such as the Texan's epitome of the clothing situation toward the end, when he said, "In this army one hole in the seat of the breeches indicates a captain, two holes a lieutenant, and the seat of the pants all out indicates that the individual is a private." Or another man's pungent description of the food: "The beef is so poor it is Sticky and Blue, if a quarter was thrown against the wall it would stick." Or the taunt flung at an officer riding through camp, sporting a finely twisted moustache: "Take them mice out'er yout mouth; take 'em out; no use to say they ain't thar; see their tails hangin' out." By piling carefully selected quotations upon quotations, Mr. Wiley captures at once the essence and the heroism of the men.

The second lecture, on the folks at home, is based principally upon letters written to Governor Zebulon B. Vance. The sufferings of home folk in that war, especially in urbanized areas where there was seldom enough food, clothing, or fuel, was intense, for the land of the people was invaded and their soil bitterly contested. The rural folk also had their problems of labor and tools but they seldom wanted for food. Speculation, greed, and inflation were rife on a homefront which would have been completely shameful but for the steadfast yeomanry of the South. Balance is difficult to achieve in sketching the Confederate civilian panorama; with customary skill Mr. Wiley achieves it.

It is in the lecture upon the black folk that Mr. Wiley does the little moralizing that appears in these objective lectures. Here the Negro is shown under Federal influence as insolent, violent, and independent, as might be expected under circumstances existing at that

time. But the usual concept of the loyal slave is all but destroyed in Mr. Wiley's able presentation of Negroes in the areas still Confederate as little less independent and hard to control, especially by the women who were left with the task of directing their work, than their brothers in the Federal dominated sections. Altogether Mr. Wiley suggests that the slavery issue was not well settled in 1865, that its poor settlement is still an impediment to good race relations in the South, and he infers that Southerners today may be as ignorant of the thoughts and desires of the Negro living among them as their forefathers were in 1861-65.

This is a little book for which one can have a vast enthusiasm. The lectures are sprightly and informative, shrewd and gay, forceful and scholarly. Mr. Wiley has mastered the craft of integrating contemporary materials into sentences and paragraphs of his own in such a manner that the spirit of the times and certain charm are added to his own smooth and graceful expression.

University of North Carolina Press
Chapel Hill, N. C. GEORGE F. SCHEER

FIGHTING DAN OF THE LONG RIFLES. By Sidney W. Dean. Philadelphia: Macrae-Smith-Company, 1942. Pp. 320. $2.50.

This is a story of the life of General Daniel Morgan for older boys. It has the distinction of being the first biography of Morgan to appear in more than fifty years and enthusiastically renews the vigorous story of the mighty wagoner of the Shenandoah who fought his way through a wild undisciplined youth, an heroic manhood and an honored old age. Hard to match for dramatic qualities was the life of the wandering Welsh lad who drifted into the Valley of Virginia, through diligence and hard work acquired his own wagon and team, hired himself out to haul with Major General Edward Braddock, served with legendary Captain Jack Ashby in his ranger company, and marched his own rifle company to Cambridge to make a unique career in the American Revolution. Nor any less dramatic were the later days when he marched against the Whiskey Boys or fought violently in the halls of Congress.

The spirit of that story is captured by Mr. Dean in this fictionalized biography. There is need for such a book as this, and it might have found an honored place among books for American boys. Unfortunately, Mr. Dean's study deplorably fails to meet the notable standard that has been set in recent years for juveniles, and contributing causes are grievious factual errors, failure to exploit local background and color, and failure to interpret the character of Fighting Dan. In handling battle pieces of the Revolution, the author paints lively and vivid canvases that have about them an air of accuracy. Therefore, the presence of many rather obvious errors in other por-

tions of the book seems to result from a combination of laziness and indifference.

A few of them are worth hasty examination. On page xii (Foreword), Fort Duquesne becomes Duchesne and remains so throughout the volume. Sir Henry Clinton, instead of Sir Thomas Gage, is said to have been the British officer on the Braddock expedition who years later opposed Gates in the Revolution. In depicting the growth of the lad, Dan Morgan, the author misses an opportunity to the development of a great American spirit by falling into numbers of errors which tend to present a distorted account of the boy's triumph over his handicaps and rough environment. Mr. Dean accepts a geneology for Morgan which defies proof; he even goes so far as to relate Morgan to Daniel Boone, although John Bakeless, presentday authority on Boone, does not accept such a relationship. The continued carelessness of the author may be seen in such errors as (p. 19) calling Lord Fairfax, Lord Halifax; saying that George Washington's surveying trips for Fairfax emanated from Winchester, instead of from Greenway Court; on p. 33 placing Morgan as a quartermaster in Washington's militia on the return from Braddock's expedition, instead of in Captain Jack Ashby's Ranger Company. On p. 34, Dan Morgan relaxes at Peter Lauck's tavern in Winchester; the tavern was not operated by Peter Lauck at the time, for Lauck was then not three years old. Morgan's famous flogging is placed by the author at Fort Chiswell, which itself is moved hundreds of miles out of location; even Henry Howe, who relates that the flogging took place at Fort Chiswell, questions the fort as the scene of the punishment, and in recent years enough evidence has come to light to make it certain that the flogging took place on the Braddock expedition. Again on p. 42 a tavern comes into being years before its actual period of existence. Dan is made an intimate friend of Charles Thruston (on p. 43) before 1756, while on p. 62, Thruston enters the Valley country in 1768, about the time he actually did settle there. Morgan is pictured as buying property (p. 44) in 1756 which he did not buy before the Revolution; at this point the author sets Dan out as a proprietor with a stud farm in a period in which young Morgan was still an unsettled frontier ruffian. On p. 53 Morgan is said to have given the name Soldier's Rest to the property he bought in 1756. This property was, in truth, that upon which his first home, Saratoga, was built during the war, and he did not acquire Soldier's Rest until after 1790.

To continue to select such flagrant factual errors would seem picayune. Their complete effect, however, is calculated to show Dan Morgan as settling down early in life and acquiring stabilty and fortune, which is far from the truth and the essence of his story. He was not, as the author claims, granted lands in Berkeley County, did not buy property by 1761 or 1762, did not build a home until he was prominent, did not build his own mill until after the Revolution. In short, Mr. Dean falls into every error made by Graham, first biographer of Morgan, and commits others of his own.

Consequently, it would have been well to omit the bibliography which Mr. Dean lists, evidently as an indication of his scholarly method. This bibliography demands attention, lest some unwary but sincere historian lose valuable time endeavoring to find some of the materials listed. For example, Mr. Dean lists: "Bedinger, Henry (Rifleman). *Diary and Letters. 1777, et seq.*" Although listed among printed sources, there is no such volume; this material is found in Danske Dandridge's *Historic Shepherdstown*, which is set down several lines below as a separate source. Also in this list is: "Griffith, R. E. *Morgan Will and Family Papers.* Winchester, Va. (Contemporary)." These are, of course, records of Frederick County, to which Mr. Griffith, Winchester historian, doubtless led the author. Similar errors occur throughout the bibliography. Under "Letters and Official Correspondence," Mr. Dean places printed as well as manuscript sources, but no distinction is made between them; the whereabouts of manuscript sources given are taken from Graham's *Morgan* (1858), as if the manuscripts were still in the places in which Graham found them! Under "Morgan's Own Manuscripts," two are listed with no mention of their whereabouts. Both are published in Graham. Even at casual examination this bibliography reveals no less than twenty-five errors of omission or duplication or fabrication. This is an offensive practice, for the student may well be troubled trying to run down some of the non-existent manuscripts and published sources that Mr. Dean lists.

He would have done well to have consulted the author of a forthcoming, definitive biography of Morgan, part of whose manuscript he examined in Winchester, and to whom he might easily have been led. Errors of fact as well as judgment would then have been avoided.

One's admiration for Mr. Dean's ideas and the gusto of his style for boys is not dulled by his carelessness, however. It is this reviewer's hope that he may tighten his factual stories as he continues to recreate so admirably the spirit of the heroic American past.

University of North Carolina Press
Chapel Hill, N. C.

GEORGE F. SCHEER

State History as Featured by the Press

MAGAZINES:

MISSOURI HISTORICAL REVIEW (October, 1944), *Women and Children on the Oregon-California Trail in the Gold Rush Years*, by Georgia W. Read.

WEST VIRGINIA REVIEW (December, 1944), *"Eden's Acres," Story of Blennerhassett Island*, pt. 1, by Benjamin F. Ball; (January, 1945), *The State Makes Her Bow*, by Eva Margaret Carnes; *"Eden's Acres," Story of Blennerhassett Island*, pt. 2 by Benjamin F. Ball; (February, 1945), *Twenty Years with Our State Poets*, by Fred Mannington Smith.

SOUTH ATLANTIC QUARTERLY (January, 1945), *The Army of Northern Virginia*, by R. H. Woody.

JOURNAL OF MODERN HISTORY (December, 1944), *President Madison's Foreign Policy—The Views of an American Merchant Abroad in 1811*, by Franklin D. Scott.

TYLER'S QUARTERLY HISTORICAL AND GENEALOGICAL MAGAZINE (January, 1945), *Plain Truth about the Bixby Letter*, by David R. Barbie.

NEWSPAPERS:

CHARLESTON DAILY MAIL, *Washington's Gift Still Pays Part for Educating Youth at University* [W. & L.], February 11.

CHARLESTON GAZETTE, *Dr. Fletcher H. Fast, President Kanawha Valley Dental Association, Dies at Clay Home*, January 13.

FAIRMONT TIMES, *Fairmont Elks Lodge Founded 50 Years Ago*, January 15; *Two Hundred Fifty Banquet at Elks and Hear History Told*, January 17; *James B. Canning Leaves Books to Marion County Library*, January 25; *Books by West Virginia Authors and Books about West Virginia*, February 8; *John L. Finlayson Writes History of Shinnston Tornado;* all from DO YOU REMEMBER, a column by E. E. Meredith; *Death Takes Distinguished Citizen, Brooks Fleming, Jr.*, February 8.

GRAFTON SENTINEL, *Elsie Lippencott, Grafton's First Telephone Operator, Dies in Chicago*, February 23.

PARKERSBURG NEWS, *State to Acquire Historic Blennerhassett Island*, January 8; *Dr. A. B. Cooper Writes of School System in Late 1800's*, February 11.

BECKLEY POST-HERALD, *Isaac C. Prince, Beckley's Pioneer Banker, Coal Developer, Dies in Beckley Hospital*, February 6.

ST. MARY'S ORACLE, *Looking Back—Story of The Oracle; First Appeared in 1882*, January 18.

WEST UNION RECORD, *Doddridge County 100 Years Old February 4*, by Clay D. Hammond.

Recent Accessions to the State Department of Archives and History

---

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION, 1944. (Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, pp. 386.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF CHIEF OF ENGINEERS U. S. ARMY. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1944 pp. 386.)

BRITANNICA BOOK OF THE YEAR. (Chicago, Illinois: Encyclopedia-Britannica, Inc., 1944, pp. 812.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE AMERICAN HISTORY ASSOCIATION. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1944, pp. 75.)

DUKE ENDOWMENT YEARBOOK, 1944. (Charlotte, N. C.: Duke Endowment.)

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS, 1942. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.)

OREGON REPORTS, 1943. (Salem, Oregon: State Printing Department.)

UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS REPORTS. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.)

CUMULATIVE BOOK INDEX, August-December, 1944. (New York: H. W. Wilson Co. pp. 388.)

REGISTER OF COMMISSIONED AND WARRANT OFFICERS OF U. S. NAVY AND MARINE CORPS, 1944. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, pp. 1169.)

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—78th. Congress, 2nd. Session—January 10, 1944 to March 24, 1944. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, Appendix.)

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—78th. Congress, 2nd. Session—February 9, 1944 to March 21, 1944. (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.)

Contributors

Roy Watson Curry, of Gormania, West Virginia, received his Master's degree in history from West Virginia University in 1940. His "The Newspaper Press and the Civil War in West Virginia" (Master's thesis), was contributed to this issue by the Department of History, West Virginia University.

Charles J. Milton was born at "Shepherd Hall," now known as "Monument Place," built in 1798 in Wheeling, West Virginia. Mr. Milton's preparatory education was obtained at Lawrenceville School, New Jersey, and St. Johns, Manlius, New York; and his college education at Syracuse University. He is Acting Director of Museums, Oglebay Institute, Oglebay Park, Wheeling. He is author of *Landmarks of Old Wheeling*, published in 1943.

William E. Brooks, pastor of The First Presbyterian Church, Morgantown, West Virginia. For biographical sketch see Volume IV, page 231.

George F. Scheer is a native of Richmond, Virginia. Mr. Scheer was for sometime a freelance feature writer for the Richmond *Times-Dispatch* and the Richmond *News Leader*. Until recently he was text writer and editor in the Quartermaster Technical Training Service, Quartermaster School, Camp Lee, Virginia. At present, he is a member of the staff of the University of North Carolina Press. Mr. Scheer is the author of a forthcoming biography of General Francis Marion, the Swamp Fox: the first biography (except for several juveniles) of the renowned partisan of the American Revolution in more than one hundred years.